THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, M.A., Redhill Rectory, Havant, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. I NOVEMBER, 1920 No. 5

TENDENCIES OF CATHOLICISM*

The object of this paper is to examine certain tendencies inherent in the Catholic religion which have affected its presentation to the world from the beginning, and presumably will continue to do so to the end. It is not in any sense a criticism of the doctrines or practices of any particular "school of thought"; nor is it intended to deal with the questions at issue between the various branches of the Catholic Church.

Christianity in its essence is a synthesis of two quite different forms of religion. It took its origin in a definite circle of Jewish thought, which was very widely disseminated in Galilee, but was by no means the only form of Judaism recognized as orthodox during Our Lord's earthly life. This particular type, however, was marked by certain characteristics which made it peculiarly adapted as the vehicle of His revelation. It was devout in its observance of the Law of Moses, but had not yet allowed that observance to degenerate into the pedantic efforts of the Pharisees and their Rabbinical successors to safeguard the faithful from the slightest danger of transgressing the least of the commandments. It was violently patriotic and filled with opposition to the Gentile claim to dominate the Chosen People, but it had not yet developed into the campaign of sporadic violence which culminates in the Jewish Rebellion. It was looking for the Messiah, and had not followed the false messiahs who were always appearing.

The effect of Our Lord in this circle was to produce a quite new conception of life. Devotion to the Law as the means of serving God, and so earning the right to share in the Messianic kingdom, was changed into a devotion to the ideal pattern of life held up by Our Lord, as a means of escaping from the misery of this world, and so sharing in a kingdom which, although still regarded as imminent, was definitely supernatural. The Law was regarded as a necessary part of Christian piety, but it was no longer the centre of life.

* A paper read to the Winchester Diocesan Association of the Federation of Catholic Priests on June 8, 1920.

men are." On the other hand, the emotional and sensational appeal must always be used as a means for moulding the reason and will, or it becomes a mere paganism in Christian dress—a non-moral religion of periodical thrills produced by external means and losing its influence when the sensible fit of devotion has passed.

Now in England the religious revival of the last century has grasped the need of the element of mystery-religion—the emotional element to the full. We find it in the attempts to revive Protestantism, with their emotional hymns and their " prophetic " sermons; for, of course, rhetoric may be a means of appealing to the emotions, no less than music or dramatic ritual. In regard to Catholicism the same is true. In the Roman communion the stray personal piety of the survivors of the Reformation and the persecutions, which tended to a very restrained external expression of devotion, has been supplemented since the days of Manning by a vigorous development of the richer forms of devotion. In our own communion the Tractarians, with their high standard of piety and scrupulous doctrinal orthodoxy in matters of devotion, have been superseded by the Ritualist school, which frankly bases its appeal to the world at large on the emotional attraction of Catholic ritual and devotions. This is necessary, if the faith is ever to be preached outside academic circles. But at the same time it has its dangers.

For there are signs that modern Catholicism is being carried away by its enthusiasm for the fulness of Catholic teaching and practice into a light-hearted acceptance of just that view of the Catholic religion which led to the Reformation. We all remember the demand for " vestments, lights, and incense "—trappings of religion which, however beautiful and legitimate, had been in use for thousands of years before Abraham started on his journey from Ur of the Chaldees. But the matter goes much deeper than any such obviously external things as these. The whole Catholic religion derives a very large part of its claim to acceptance from the fact that it has incorporated all the various forms of emotional appeal which are to be found singly in other religions. But it claims to use them always as means to an end—the development in the individual soul of specifically Christian sanctity, based on the pattern of Our Lord. And the danger is that the individual Christian may simply content himself by gratifying his religious instincts with that emotional appeal, but, so soon as the fit of emotion is over, allow himself, like the votaries of most mystery-religions, to relapse into a perfectly pagan life. In other words, the gratification of the religious instincts is regarded as an end in itself, not as a means to an end.

For this failure is perfectly compatible with the acceptance of the Catholic religion. It is perfectly possible for a person to make of the Sacrament of Penance a means of soothing an emotional sorrow

for sin which is quite real, but practically unrelated to future amend, ment, and to make of the Blessed Sacrament a means of gratifying the desire of the soul for visible communion with the supernatural, without effectively relating it to the standard of human perfection revealed in the human life of Jesus. It is possible and even easy to recite the Rosary devoutly without ever considering the lessons given us in the earthly life and teaching of Our Lord.

Now there is little doubt that modern developments in the Western Church tend to enhance this possibility. The increase of devotion to the Papacy, and the tendency to make of it a visible and infallible oracle in spheres entirely beyond those of the Vatican definition, and the elevation of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception to a dogma of faith, are symptoms of it; and the refusal to admit the applicability of sober modern criticism to the Scriptures is another. The whole emphasis is thrown on a distorted conception of the sphere of the supernatural in the Christian revelation to the exclusion of the fact that it is a revelation conveyed in terms of humanity. It would be easy to find in the modern development of devotion to the saints a number of symptoms of the same kind.

It is always wise to learn from your opponents. And if we look at the main modern heresies and false doctrines, we shall find that they all display a great devotion to Our Lord as a human teacher and example. They talk of the true spirit of Christianity, meaning by it the love and tenderness revealed in this earthly life, and in some cases really show a zeal for following it. And from a purely *à priori* view it is wise to ask whether this may not be due to some failure on the part of the Church to realize that the only justification for her existence is that she may testify to all time to the fact of the Incarnation as the means whereby man is enabled to imitate the Incarnate life of God the Son—the Way, the Truth, and the Life. And if we follow up our *à priori* suspicion with an investigation of the facts, we shall find our suspicions confirmed. We must remember that the English nation no longer reads its Bible. The ordinary Englishman may have had some very dull instruction in some books of the Old or New Testament at school, or he may not. But frequently even if he has read some part of the Gospels, he hardly consciously associates the Jesus whom he worships in the Mass, the Monstrance, or the Tabernacle with the Jesus who walked and talked in Galilee. Similarly he says the Rosary in honour of a God who was born, and died, and rose from the dead (like Adonis, Osiris, or Mithras), but often forgets that he is doing so in honour of a God whose human life it is our task to imitate. Of course, the Rosary is an excellent devotion; but if those who recite it know nothing of the human pattern of Jesus, it is purely a piece of mystery-religion or mumbo-jumbo—part of a religion in which we are saved, not by

personal holiness, but by the performance of external religious actions, and by fits of emotional religion—" sensible devotion " is the name of ascetic writers.

And in the same way it is possible for us to make a grave error by declining to consider the validity within reasonable limits of modern views as to the criticism of the Bible. We are tending to assume that the Bible—a closed book to the mass of our people—is a divinely dictated work, which will prove by isolated texts the truth of our claims—the old Protestant error—not a divinely inspired book, which, the more thoroughly it is examined, will prove the historical truth of the Christian revelation and the claims of the Catholic Church to be the guardian of that revelation. The denial of the right of unrestricted private judgment does not exclude the right to think for one's self within the wide limits permitted by the Universal Church, unless we believe that our religion is of an authority too doubtful to bear investigation.

To sum up, there is need of a careful adjustment of teaching and practice, which will bear in mind the necessity of preserving the balance between the two elements of Christianity. It is, and must always be, a religion which appeals to the emotions of man, and therefore has the right to use those external means for appealing to the emotions which religion has always used. But it only uses these emotions as a means for influencing the reason and the will—either as a means for humiliating the arrogance and self-righteousness which are the besetting sin of the learned and the pious, or as a means for strengthening the wills which would otherwise be too weak to endeavour to rise above the natural level of human iniquity. And it has failed in its task if it ever allows its followers to think that they can be content with the mean gratification of the emotions by outbursts of sensible devotion, and need not make their lives a continual endeavour to attain to a perfectly definite standard of human perfection.

And in modelling our teaching and practice on these lines it is necessary for us to bear in mind how easy it is for the world at the present day to be content with a purely emotional religion. The ignorant like a clear-cut and dogmatic teaching, with a definite answer to every question: in some cases indeed it is necessary to give it, for there are many who need milk and not meat. Even more the person who is hunting for a religion and hesitating between theosophy and Catholicism demands such a faith—a faith that calls neither for thought nor for self-sacrifice. They will greedily swallow a religion of emotion pure and simple, and will never grasp the fact that our faith is a religion of self-sacrifice, involving not an observance of the conventions of the world, but the bearing of the Cross of Christ, the struggle after Christian perfection.

And meanwhile, when we put the truth before those who are in a position to test the merits of our claims, if we try to persuade them to accept a religion which stresses its supernatural claims, and yet obviously fails to produce, in the general body of those who profess it, any supernatural result, they simply answer that, until we can produce in the lives of Christians evidence for the truth of Christianity, it is impossible for them to accept it. And in justice the blame for their rejection of it will rest upon us.

WILFRED L. KNOX.

HISTORY AND FOLKLORE IN GENESIS

THE sermon preached at the meeting of the British Association at Cardiff in the summer, and the discussion it evoked, would have been of little consequence had they stood alone; but it is clear that the doctrine of the reduced Bible has warm advocates in Convocation, who have pushed their views to extreme lengths in the discussions on the Revision of our Book of Common Prayer.

I shudder to think what they are making of it. The reference to "our first parents Adam and Eve," I believe, is to be omitted from the Marriage Service. The "saving of Noah and his family in the ark from perishing by water" is to disappear from the Baptismal Service. The Divine blessing vouchsafed to Abraham and Sarah, which brought to them "great comfort," is no longer to be conveyed as a model for that bestowed upon the happy couple in a Christian marriage. Indeed, I know not where these good people intend to stay their reforming hands if references to Old Testament characters are to be all struck out as unfit for modernist ears. It will be a sorry Prayer-Book when they have finished with it. And then I suppose they will have to reform the Bible. The verse in 1 Cor. xv., "As in Adam all die," I suppose must be omitted. The learned Canon who said he did not believe in Noah must omit his name from our Lord's utterance, "though these three men—Noah, Daniel, and Job—were in it," and probably Daniel and Job would disappear with poor Noah. I need not quote countless other references to passages in the New Testament containing references to the Old Testament which would be condemned by these modern ultra-reformers.

It does not seem to have occurred to them that many of these are used allegorically in accordance with the old Rabbinic method of imparting instruction. These early narratives form part of the

sacred Scriptures which are " a rule and a guide to our faith." Few of us, I suppose, believe that the story of the Fall is the record of a literally historical event that happened in the dawn of the world; but it is full of didactic teaching based upon a story that came down to the writer from the earliest time. It points a moral of the highest importance. Adam is the type of human frailty and disobedience which cause death and sin, in contrast to the second Adam who brought life and salvation. Must we strike out of our Bibles Rom. v. 14: " Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them who had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of Him that was to come "? I shall endeavour presently to trace the origins of some of these early narratives; but I maintain that it is wrong to reject the allegorical interpretations of Old Testament types and figures, and the lessons to be learnt from them, because we cannot always accept the narratives as being literally historically true. The Fathers constantly used this allegorical interpretation. They held that the formation of Eve from the side of Adam typified the formation of the Church from the side of the Saviour, and other instances will occur to the reader.

I expect that many students of THEOLOGY will have read the recently published work by Sir James Frazer on *The Folklore of the Old Testament*, a very remarkable book, showing amazing industry and varied learning, dealing with the interpretation of the Bible. He has drawn together a vast store of myths, customs, and superstitions of various primitive peoples illustrating by analogy the Old Testament Scriptures. The idea is not new. Dr. Skinner's *Commentary on Genesis*, and Dr. G. Buchanan Gray's *Commentary on Numbers*, published during the present century, both contain much valuable material of this kind, but no one has published anything to be compared with the vast and varied store of information which Sir James Frazer has placed before us in these three volumes. So imposing a mass is not without its dangers; for we are tempted at first to imagine that we have here a complete statement of the facts, whereas in reality we have only samples, the preservation of which has been largely the work of chance. Of the beliefs and practices current in the ancient world an immense proportion has perished without leaving a trace.

It is particularly important to bear in mind that the writers of the Old Testament are never mere mouthpieces of popular tradition; their aim is moral and religious edification. They did not care so much about the truth or falsehood of the old legends, so long as they grafted upon the story some didactic teaching and a firm belief in God's moral government of the world. Sir James's legendary analogies, I venture to think, cannot be accepted as the whole truth; they are interesting and suggestive. They wander away into mazes

wherein it is easy to lose ourselves. They are often vastly ingenious and startling, but in many instances they confirm our faith in the Bible narratives and in the truths to be derived from them.

Our good friends in Convocation have, as I have said, banished "Abraham and Sarah" from our Marriage Service, to their great comfort, on the ground, I suppose, that they are imaginary characters and never existed. They will find no support in Sir James's pages. He writes:

"I see no sufficient reason to question, with some modern writers, the historical reality of the great Hebrew patriarchs, though doubtless some of the incidents and details which tradition has recorded concerning them are unhistorical."

Of their life he thus writes so gracefully and well:

"The history takes the form of a series of biographies in which the fortunes of the nation are set forth, not in vague general outlines, but in a series of brilliantly coloured pictures recording the adventures of individual men, the forefathers of their race. The unity which runs through the lives of the patriarchs is not merely genealogical; a community of occupation as well as of blood binds these ancestors of Israel together: all are nomadic shepherds and herdsmen, roaming from place to place with their flocks and herds in search of fresh pastures; they have not yet settled down to the humdrum life of the peasant, who repeats, year after year, the same monotonous round of labour on the same fields on which his father and his father's father had laboured all their days before him. In short, it is the pastoral age which the writers of Genesis have depicted with a clearness of outline and a vivacious colouring which time has not dimmed, and which, under all the changed conditions of modern life, still hold the reader spellbound by their ineffable charm."

I am glad to quote that passage, as those who have not read the book will realize something of the grace and charm of Sir James Frazer's style of writing.

I do not propose in this paper to dwell upon the account of the creation of the world as recorded in Genesis, or to attempt to reconcile it with the teaching of science. I take it to be a brief description of the adaptation of the earth for the use of man. I remember reading a thick volume (Dr. Kinns's), which was designed to show that the order of the creation of plants and animals, as revealed in the Bible, corresponded with that recorded by science. But I am afraid that the author's scientific knowledge was defective, and the correspondence was neither exact nor accurate. But so much has been written about the first chapter of Genesis that I will pass over its consideration.

Now as regards the origin of man, Sir James Frazer says that the Jehovistic narrative is the more primitive. The writer seems

to have imagined that God moulded the first man out of clay, just as a potter might do, or as a child moulds a doll out of mud, and that having kneeded and patted the clay into the proper shape, the Deity animated it by breathing into the mouth and nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul. This conclusion must have been suggestive to the Hebrew mind, as their word for ground is *Adamah*, the feminine of the word for *man* (Adam). Driver and W. H. Bennett state that the Babylonians also conceived man to have been moulded out of clay. There is a curious Babylonian story of the god Bell cutting off his own head, and the other gods catching his blood, mixing it with earth, and fashioning men out of the bloody paste. That is why men are so wise: their mortal clay is tempered with blood divine. There is a somewhat similar story in Egyptian mythology, Khnoumou, the Father of the Gods, moulding men out of clay on his potter's wheel. So in the Greek legend Prometheus is said to have moulded the first men out of clay. Now do all these various legends spring from the same source? Some persons seem to think that the writer P., having met with the Babylonian tradition after the captivity, incorporated it in his document; but then we have J., which is far earlier, and that writer probably wrote down the tradition as he had received it from an earlier scribe. It seems to me that the widespread character of these stories seems to point to a common origin. They cannot be the results of imagination.

And then did God create one man, Adam, and did all the human species spring from him and his wife Eve? These are questions about which we have to try to make up our minds, as Bishop Gore with his usual candour and straightforwardness once said to his Diocesan Inspectors. I find in *Essays and Reviews* that the original formation of only one pair of human beings is taught only in the second chapter of Genesis, and not in the first. Man is said to have been created male and female, and the narrative contains nothing to show that a single pair only is intended. Objections have been raised to this statement (see *Aids to Faith*), but in the very wide diffusion of the human race, dating back to something like a million of years, it is difficult to believe that all sprang from the Garden of Eden. Our historic horizon has in recent years been vastly increased. We have long ago abandoned the chronological idea that 6,000 years separate the creation of the world from our present era. We can trace the stages of man's development from the dim prehistoric past down to historic times. There lived in the First Glacial Period the Heidelberg man, whose remains have been discovered. Between that period and the Neolithic Period Professor Keith and Buttel-Reepen, a German savant, state that there elapsed something like a million or more years. In the Second Glacial Period lived the mammoth, and the Second Inter-Glacial Period, extending over two to three hundred

thousand years, is marked by the Neanderthal man along with the mammoth, cave-bear, and *Elephas antiquus*. These continued to exist during the Third Glacial Period and the Third Inter-Glacial Period, lasting some 100,000 years, when lived the Grimaldi, the Aurignac, and the Cromagnon races of man, with rhinoceros and horse. The Cromagnon race were reindeer hunters, and the Magdalenian race have left us magnificent series of representations on bone and ivory of such animals as the mammoth, rhinoceros, reindeer and stag, and bison, in frescoes and drawings on ceilings and walls of caves of Altamira and Alpera in Spain and elsewhere. Then follows the alluvial or present age and the Neolithic and all succeeding periods in the life of man.*

It is difficult, bearing in mind the antiquity of man, to reconcile it with the story told to us in Genesis.

What, then, are we to do? What can we say?

We are inclined to say that we regard the books of the Old Testament as inspired by God; they come to us hallowed with so many religious associations. We are inclined to exclaim: "Hands off! Defile not the holy thing with profane touch; this is sacred ground, and must be approached only by those from whose feet the shoes have been reverently put off." But we cannot reject what science teaches.

Can we say that the story in Genesis represents the efforts of early poets and thinkers of Israel to arrive at an understanding of the world and man as these presented themselves to them? Sin and suffering had to be accounted for, and they did it in the way that best suited their own simple minds and those of their hearers. No doubt their account was largely based on traditions handed down from primitive times, but under the influence and guidance, as we may surely believe, of the Spirit of God they transformed the tales that had come down to them, and changed the crude polytheism of Babylonia into the vehicle of a monotheistic faith, and so rendered them capable of conveying high moral teaching which should be suitable for every age. In teaching and preaching to unlettered rustics I should venture to deprecate the disturbing of simple faith, but it might be well to dwell on the moral teaching more than on the natural facts as recorded.

Can we, in view of the light which modern science has thrown upon us, assert that the stories of the Creation and the Fall are historical facts? We can certainly look at the Old Testament from the point of view that it enshrines the highest revelation of God to man before the coming of our Saviour Jesus Christ, without asserting that everything it contains is literal and exact history. And if people point, for instance, to St. Paul's application of the story of Abraham and Hagar and Ishmael, and say it must be true, or St. Paul would not

* *Hibbert Journal*, vol. xvi., no. 2, p. 298.

have used it, I would be inclined to answer: "The Apostle says nothing about its being literal history; but after the fashion of the Rabbinical schools in which he was trained, he treats it throughout distinctly as an allegory, and applies it to the Christian purpose he had in view. And therein St. Paul showed himself wiser than our modern ecclesiastics, who are proposing to cut out all references in our revised Prayer-Book to Old Testament narratives and characters.

Take the story of the Flood, which occupies some 250 pages in Sir James Frazer's book. We all remember Professor Huxley's violent attack upon the old ark, its top-heavy construction, its incapacity for sailing. He laughed and jeered at the ark. That happily is not the method of modern scientists. We do not expect exact details in a story that has come down to us from the earliest times. The Hebrew story, as it stands, is well known now to be composite. There are J. and P. elements which are combined in such a way that they can easily be disentangled. Both seem to be dependent on Babylonian tradition, the first being derived from the prehistoric tradition which the ancestors of Israel carried with them when they left their early home to travel westward, the second being added during the exile. But how comes it that amongst almost all primitive races (except, so Sir James states, in Africa) there are stories of floods? Can it be that there was one prehistoric story of a flood, and that as the races spread they carried it with them? That, I fear, cannot be accepted now. Most of these stories are in each case dependent on local conditions. There is the ancient Greek story, as told by Apollodorus: "Deucalion was the son of Prometheus. He reigned as king in the country about Phthia, and married Pyrrha, the daughter of Epimetheus and Pandora, the first woman fashioned by the gods. But when Zeus wished to destroy the men of the Bronze Age, Deucalion, by the advice of Prometheus, constructed a chest or ark, and, having stored in it what was needful, he entered into it with his wife. Then Zeus sent a great rain, and all men perished save a few who fled to the high mountains. The ark grounded on Parnassus, and Deucalion sacrificed to Zeus, who allowed him to choose what he would, and he chose men. So he cast stones over his head and they became men, and his wife cast stones and they became women. That is why Greek people are called *laoi*, from *laas* (a stone)." Then there are Persian stories and those which come from ancient India, a race in China, the Lolos, the Bataks of Sumatra, Polynesia, South America, Central America and Mexico, and North America. It is all very wonderful. It is difficult to determine the origin of these diluvial traditions. Men seemed to have believed that at some time or other the whole earth (or the inhabited portion of it) had been submerged under the water of a great flood in which almost the entire human

race perished. I remember a good clergyman, not unlearned, who showed me a fossil shell from the top of Snowdon as a proof of Noah's universal deluge! Less than a century ago William Buckland, Reader in Geology at Oxford, said: "The grand fact of a universal deluge at no very remote period is proved on grounds so decisive and incontrovertible that, had we never heard of some such catastrophe from Scripture or any other authority, Geology of itself must have called in the assistance of some such catastrophe to explain the phenomenon of diluvial action."

Sir John William Dawson, in his *Story of the Earth and Man* (1880), wrote: "I have long thought that the narrative in Gen. vii. and viii. can be understood only on the supposition that it is a contemporary journal or log of an eye-witness incorporated by the author of Genesis in his work." It would be pleasant to think so now, if only these good people of the twentieth century would allow us to do so. Much has been written on the subject by geologists. Professor Prestwick (no mean geologist) spoke confidently of a great submergence and accompanying diluvial catastrophe which took place shortly after the close of the Glacial Period and destroyed palæolithic man, and which is identified by him with the Deluge of Noah, and this theory was held strongly in a later book by Sir J. W. Dawson published in 1895; but Professor Bonney states that "the idea of a universal deluge, or even of closely connected but local deluges on a large scale, cannot, I think, claim any real support from geology." But from my own knowledge of the geology of southern England I can say that after palæolithic man had lived in Britain there was a great sinking of the earth, and where the London clay now exists in Berkshire there was a warm sea, and sharks swam around whose teeth we find buried in these beds of clay, some of which I possess. However, this occupied a long period of time, and no forty days' rain could have caused so great a convulsion. However, we may believe that many of these diluvial traditions dispersed throughout the world are based on reminiscences of catastrophes which actually did occur, and in that degree are historical. At any rate, the story of Noah teaches many wholesome truths of the providence of God, of the triumph of virtue, of God's care for those who fear and love Him, of His hatred of sin and punishment thereof, of the duty of thanksgiving, and much else, and it is an allegory of the saving of souls in the ark of Christ's Church, and one that every devout Christian may with advantage use. Indeed, there seems to be a school of learned folk who seem to despise the Old Testament altogether and concern themselves only with the New Testament, and thereby err greatly, and are guilty of a heresy that harassed the early Church. The New Testament grows out of, and is a fulfilment of, the Old, and cannot be slighted or disregarded. As a writer in the *Modern Church-*

man said in 1912: "The clergy and religious teachers are hindered at every step by the necessity of bringing the new into accordance with the old. We are reproached both by the friends of progress and by those who love the old ways. We draw upon ourselves the fire of two opposite armies. On the one side are those who believe that God spake to the men of old time, and to none but to them, and that it is our business to store up their words and respect them. On the other hand are those who feel sure that God does speak to us, but that He never said anything to any previous generation in which we are really concerned, who look upon the past as an old curiosity shop which busy men and women may be excused for neglecting. Some of us are not able to share either of these opinions. We regard a knowledge of the past as altogether indispensable to our understanding of the present. We endeavour by this plea to justify our existence and to excuse it may be our temerity or it may be our caution."

I have no space left wherein to discuss some of the other problems which the study of these Old Testament narratives presents. What do we understand by the mark set on Cain, or of Moses at the burning bush, or the Tower of Babel? This last story is very widely spread. I should like to have mentioned the deceit practised by Jacob on Esau in order to gain his father's blessing, and to ask whether it may be considered a case of ultimogeniture, and an attempt of the human mind to account for the custom of what we call Borough English—*i.e.*, the youngest son, and not the eldest, succeeding to the property of his sire.

There are hundreds of other problems that present themselves for solution and require careful study. It is essential that we should try to make up our minds. This can only be done by studious effort. There are many laymen to-day who are of an inquiring mind, and need guidance and help in facing such questions as I have ventured to suggest. In these days it is to be feared that reading and study are not very favourite occupations among the clergy, especially among the younger clergy. Parochial duties, the "serving of tables," endless meetings, press heavily upon their time, and leave little opportunity for close study; but it is essential that theological problems should be faced, and it is the function of this Journal to assist those who need help and guidance. Recent controversy and the proceedings in Convocation seem to betray a complete misreading of Holy Scripture. Why should we impute to the Fathers and Apostles—not to say to One greater than both—a literalism which we abjure for ourselves? But that discussion would lead us into a wide sphere, and with a hope that disaster may yet be averted this article must end.

P. H. Ditchfield.

RECENT WORK ON THE ATONEMENT

II.

Dr. Rashdall's Bampton Lectures, *The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology*, were delivered in 1915 and published in 1919.*

Here is a work which, for many a day to come, will be appealed to by the English supporters of the subjective interpretation; "Rashdall" will be named in the same sort of way as "Dale" and "Moberly." If you do not like it you must recognize its power; it is on the big scale which befits the subject; it is written in a spirit of extraordinary confidence, with practically no reservations (none at points of first-rate importance), as though the author were confident that the time had come to have done with the English caution which is glad not to dispense altogether with anything, and to say boldly that there is one true doctrine of the Atonement, and one only, and that is Abelard's. Dr. Rashdall is as rigorous as Dr. Denney; the latter was exceedingly impatient of people who seemed not to know their way about the classic paths of Christian experience; the former conveys the impression of almost equal impatience with those who seem to him to be strangers to the high work of true thinking. It is a tragic thing that we shall not read Dr. Denney's review of Dr. Rashdall, and any reply to which the latter might have felt called. Yet in one important respect there is real similarity between the two: neither is friendly towards the kind of mystical conception of Christ's human nature which not uncommonly emerges in connection with the "representative" doctrine; both are decisively opposed to Moberly in what was to that theologian a matter of fundamental importance; "a pretentious and not very intelligible idea of Christ's metaphysical relation to mankind" is Dr. Denney's estimate of the notion of Christ's inclusive humanity; Dr. Rashdall is equally severe: "as to the theory that Christ is Himself 'the universal of humanity' and not merely a particular man, that is surely a form of words to which no intelligible meaning can be attached." It is important to observe that his Christology is here in closest connection with his soteriology. He will not allow that Christ's humanity was "impersonal"; as I understand him, the enhypostasia doctrine of Leontius of Byzantium would not satisfy him, since for him Jesus Christ is *a particular man* (my italics), in whose human life and character God uniquely revealed Himself by a complete union between the logos of God and Christ's human soul. It is the old Antiochene tradition with regard to Christ's

* *The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology*, by Hastings Rashdall, D.Litt., D.C.L., LL.D., Dean of Carlisle. Macmillan. 1919. 15s. net.

Person pushed very far, and in these pages of Dr. Rashdall I feel what other writings of his have made me feel—the desire that he should show how or whether, if his Christological and Trinitarian conceptions (the doctrine of a particular man completely united with the Logos, and of the Trinity as One Mind which admits of no distinction of thought and consciousness as between the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit) are, as he certainly would maintain, Catholic, there is any real division between Catholic doctrine and Unitarianism—not necessarily in its early Socinian form, but in statements about God and Christ which would accept the conception of God as Power, Wisdom, and Will or Love, and allow of a special relationship between Jesus and God. Where is the dividing-line? "That God is Power, and Wisdom, and Love is simply the essence of Christian Theism—not the less true because few Unitarians would repudiate it": these are Dr. Rashdall's words in an earlier book, *Philosophy and Religion*. Is, then, the Unitarian controversy intellectually dead?

This digression, while far from unimportant in itself, makes it appear only natural that Dr. Rashdall should give up the whole substitutionary conception, in whatever form it is held. The substitution of Jesus, a particular of humanity, for all other particulars, is neither rationally nor morally defensible. I have referred to Dr. Rashdall's position as Antiochene: it is interesting to note how, in his confession of faith, given in Hahn's *Bibliothek* (3rd edition, pp. 302-304), Theodore of Mopsuestia, the great Antiochene theologian, when he mentions Christ's saving work, expresses it as "the leading of all" by Christ, the Lord from heaven, "to imitate Himself"; later on he speaks of "the saving repentance." The former idea is not far removed from that emphasis which Dr. Rashdall lays upon the words of Christ, and the moral ideal embodied in His teaching and character.

In Dr. Rashdall's argument we may note the following important positions and conclusions. Firstly, there is nothing in the Gospels, properly interpreted, which sharply distinguishes the character of Christ's work on the Cross from the work of His whole ministry, nor is any doctrine of expiatory sacrifice to be extracted from the Ransom passage, or from Christ's words at the Last Supper. Where there is sincere human repentance, there is bestowed the divine forgiveness, is the doctrine of our Lord. Secondly, the Early Church found a prophecy of Christ's death in Isaiah liii., and applied to Him the conceptions of a sin-bearing sufferer which that chapter of Scripture contains; except in the case of St. Paul, no theory was devised, the Church rested on traditional formulas; St. Paul, under pressure of the controversy about the law, presented the death of Christ as an expiation, for the sins of men; he did not work out

an entirely clear theory of substituted sacrifice or substituted punishment, but the idea cannot be evaded; and in this he stood alone. Thirdly, the most spiritual patristic view of the Atonement is to be found among Eastern, not Western, Fathers, the ethic of the latter being deeply harmed by the legalism inherent in it; of Tertullian and Augustine Dr. Rashdall is a severe critic. Fourthly, the Anselmic doctrine of satisfaction, which, in a modified form, was incorporated in the Thomist theology, is not to be essentially distinguished from the penal theology of the Reformers; but the scholastics had a definite advantage in their view of justification as a making just, which, though philologically untenable, contains a far more adequate idea than the forensic interpretation, to which Luther clung so passionately. Though it is not at the centre of Dr. Rashdall's work, few things in the book are more interesting than his treatment of this controversy. And one may say that at this point he is certainly clearer than Dr. Denney. I have already shown how for the Scottish theologian *fides* is essentially not *informis*, but *caritate formata*. "Trust and love," he says, "are indissolubly intertwined": yet he praises Luther for his emphasis on faith alone; it is true that he goes on to add that every Christian experience, call it sanctification or love or regeneration, "lies within faith and is dependent upon it." But is this what Luther meant? Dr. Rashdall interprets him very differently; that for Luther faith is simply belief, and that salvation by faith only meant for the Reformer "salvation by faith without love." Yet Dr. Rashdall admits another strain, in which faith is identified with confidence or trust. In so far as the question is a really living one, a concordat ought not to be impossible. Fifthly, the expiatory view implies the retributive view of punishment, a view whose ancestry Dr. Rashdall finds in the primitive desire for revenge, and which he judges to be inconsistent with God's character as love.

All of these points raise great issues, and with some of them I have dealt in a review for another journal. Here I would concentrate criticism in two or three remarks. Firstly, Dr. Rashdall's treatment of the New Testament seems more impressive than sound; he has said what can be said against the view that Christ connected His death with the forgiveness of sins, without nearly reaching the point where the defenders of a position must feel that they are fighting a losing battle against an overwhelming weight of argument; he presses further than the evidence warrants the idea that the New Testament writers, other than St. Paul, used, as to the objective efficacy of Christ's death, traditional formulæ which—so I judge the argument to run—bore no relation to any spiritual experience which they possessed; and no slight problem seems to be raised if, in his doctrine of the substitutionary Atone-

ment, St. Paul was as wrong—intellectually and morally—as on Dr. Rashdall's view we must (whatever allowances we make for the age in which he lived, and special facts of his temperament) regard him. The objective Atonement was not the whole of St. Paul's Gospel, but it was integral to it, and even at its centre; if St. Paul was wrong at this point, then 1 Corinthians ii., the classic chapter on apostolic inspiration, needs rewriting.

Secondly, Dr. Rashdall's pages seem to reflect neither the New Testament nor the Christian conscience, as seen in the great saints and in the normal attitude of Christian believers in respect of God's holiness, human sin, and the reaction of the former from the latter. The doctrine of objective Atonement rests upon the conviction of the disintegration of the moral order—so far as that is possible—caused by man's sin, and of the necessity of some great act—call it reparation, satisfaction, penalty, confession—whereby the wrong done to that moral order shall be put right. For Dr. Rashdall the whole matter is simply on the individualistic level: one man, and another, and so on, sins and repents, and there is the Atonement, inasmuch as to that repentance nothing so certainly contributes as the sight of Christ crucified. The Atonement is more of a process than an act on this showing; the death of Christ, the awakening of love and repentance, the moral improvement all belong to it. It is this individualistic outlook which is challenged by such ideas as those of corporate guilt or a guilty humanity to which Dr. Rashdall objects. The phraseology may be unfortunate, but at least it tries to make clear what all theologians who hold so an objective view believe needs to be made clear—that God is not faced with, nor does He deal with, an indefinite number of sinful men and women, regarded as so many separate atoms in respect of their sin and their guilt, but with a human race that has involved itself in sin. I cannot see that there is anything unreal in such a statement, any more than there is anything unreal (though there is a margin, small or large, of error) in speaking of " England " or " Germany," or any other unity which is not simply the sum of its component individuals. In this connection one may refer to Dr. Rashdall's treatment of the relationship of retributive punishment to the objective view. It may be that all the supporters of that view believe that punishment is properly retributive; nevertheless, supposing that that belief were entirely abandoned, it does not follow that the Abelardian doctrine would be left in possession of the field; though the distinction between Anselm and the Reformers, the *aut satisfactio aut poena* is not to be pressed, yet a distinction there is. Mr. Grensted points out that Anselm deliberately refused the penal idea. The essence of the objective conception does not lie in the assertion of the necessity for penal suffering, but in the conviction that Christ in His Cross did

something for us Godward, in the matter of sin, which we could not do for ourselves.

And, finally, Dr. Rashdall does not at all do justice to the way in which the objective notion, including therein expiation and penal suffering, has been, not explained away, but spiritualized. One is surprised at times by the confidence with which the Dean brands that notion as immoral. The full rigour of his thought appears in the appendix on Dr. Dale, which, despite his tribute to Dr. Dale's Christian character, will cause both pain and regret. Now, even in Dr. Dale, there is nothing like a supposition of a need for so much penalty to match so much sin, nor is the substitutionary idea stated in a way that overlooks the all-important truth that redemption and reconciliation spring from love, not love from them. The whole theory of a transaction in which the Father and the Son were regarded as representing different interests, of a work which enables God to be gracious, whereas before its accomplishment His attitude towards man was one simply of wrath and desire to punish, has passed almost clean away. At the same time there has developed a great insistence on that positive side of Christ's atoning work which is represented by the idea of the complete obedience of His will; in other words the old distinction between the passive and active obedience has been merged in the thought that the death of Christ was not just something endured, but a work done, because all through that work the relationship of His will to the Father's cannot for a moment be overlooked. That does not do away with the expiatory and penal element; it does not mean that the thought of Christ as our substitute is wholly invalid; but it does away with mechanical reckonings, while leaving us able to say, in confidence, that the words need offend neither our intelligence nor our conscience that on the Cross Christ made "a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world." It should in fairness be added that Dr. Rashdall does not, in his survey of Christian thought, go beyond the Reformation; nevertheless he does criticize both Dr. Dale and Dr. Denney, and one may ask whether he does not treat them both as though their doctrine were altogether more rigid and less spiritual than it is.

How acute the opposition is between Dr. Rashdall and the other writers whose works have been considered is obvious. Canon Hart and he are in agreement in their antipathy to Western theory, yet even at this point there is nothing like wholehearted agreement, since Canon Hart objects to the emphasis laid upon the reparation made by Christ as man, whereas Dr. Rashdall sees in everything Christ did the work of a particular man, though a man completely united with the Logos. And if we leave Canon Hart out of account in points which are connected with the whole Western tradition, we

shall see at every point fundamental differences, as to the moral nature of God and the demands resulting from it, as to sin and the character of its connection with mankind, as to Christ and His relationship to man, as to biblical, or more precisely, apostolic inspiration and authority. Dr. Rashdall's soteriology takes its place as a close-knit view, a more radical and extensive Abelardianism, involving (less than Dr. Moberly's doctrine, but still involving) a whole theology. Were it widely accepted in the unflinching, uncompromising spirit in which it has been put forward, it would mean, despite the elements in some historic theories which could be used in its support, an enormous break with Christian tradition.

One other contribution to the subject must not be left unnoticed: Dr. Sanday's sermon on the Meaning of the Atonement, with which his last book, *Divine Overruling*,* closes. Those who remember how, in the great commentary on Romans, and in appreciation and criticism of Dr. Moberly and Dr. du Bose (though he conceded to du Bose important theological positions which he had formerly held), Dr. Sanday refused to give up that type of soteriology which has as its *locus classicus* in the New Testament Romans iii. 24-26, will find the same spirit of desire to conserve, and not to reject, present in the sermon. Dr. Sanday sides with Dr. Denney and Dr. Moffatt in believing that the faith of the Early Church, in the atoning character of Christ's death, "had its roots in the consciousness that He was Himself called upon to play the part of the suffering servant of Jehovah described in the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah." At the same time, it would not be fair to claim Dr. Sanday's support for the dogmatic constructions of the objective idea which have been built up on the basis of the text of Scripture. That kind of dogmatic construction has clearly, in his opinion, been greatly overworked. And though he is prepared to defend the use of such words as "propitiation" or "expiation," the meaning which he attaches to them is at one with that given in the great systems only in so far as the same elementary conceptions are present in both. But whereas the creators of the systems, and St. Paul also, went beyond these elementary conceptions of a gift to gain the smile of God or acute sorrow for sin passing into act, Dr. Sanday stops there, not necessarily condemning further advance, but unwilling to make the road of dogmatic construction his own. And past constructions he does to this extent condemn that "hints" in the Bible, which could be dogmatically developed, "were the wrong hints to make use of, and they were used in the wrong way." It will be realized that Dr. Sanday is concerned with method rather than with theory. Of Dr. Rashdall's insight into the Epistle to

* *Divine Overruling*, by W. Sanday, D.D., F.B.A. T. and T. Clark. 1920. 6s. net.

the Hebrews, and, by implication, into the Bible as a whole, he speaks in terms of high praise; whether he would associate himself with Dr. Rashdall as a dogmatic theologian is another question to which there is not the material for an answer.

The statements and theories with which we have been engaged have the use, besides their own intrinsic interest, of throwing light upon the various points at which more than one road may be taken. There are, indeed, a large number of these in connection with the doctrine of the death of Christ, far more than in connection with the doctrine of His Person. With regard to the latter doctrine, despite all the elaborate dogmatic constructions for which the last century was responsible, everything hinges on Philippians ii. 5-11, which I believe makes the issue clearer than any other New Testament passage, clearer than the prologue to the Fourth Gospel or than the great Christological section in Colossians i. The Philippian passage is either (one cannot avoid the either . . . or in this judgment)—is either myth or concrete truth. The building up of a Christology independently of it is, in effect, to treat it as myth. But in soteriology there is no such immediate demarcation of types which may be related to one particular New Testament statement. Romans iii. 24-26 does not provide the means for such a differentiation. Nor is there a straight line through from the New Testament to any later doctrine, Anselmic, Reformation, "moral influence," as there is from the evangelic portrait of Christ and the epistolary interpretation thereof to the doctrine of the Two Natures. To those who deny such a straight line in Christological theory, and point to the intrusion of other influences, it may at least be answered that the Greek and Latin Fathers were able to take the New Testament and depend upon it directly, with far less of their own theorizing imported, than was the case with the doctrine of the Atonement. All the interpretations of the Atonement had their appeal to Scripture, but it is impossible to overlook the amount of purely theoretical work involved in practically all of them, in, for instance, so crude a conception as that variant of the doctrine of the ransom to Satan, in which the devil, eager to seize the flesh of Christ, is caught in the mousetrap which represents the presence of Christ's divinity. Where the theoretical element is not present is in the Abelardian doctrine, but that is precisely because Abelard tried to make one scriptural idea—that of the love of God shed abroad in men's hearts (Rom. v. 5)—serve for soteriology, rather as I have suggested that the passage in Philippians serves for Christology; but the difference is that whereas that latter passage does necessarily exhibit one doctrine, and, by direct implication, reject others, that on which Abelard relies does nothing of the sort: it goes no further than to claim that for it, in any true soteriology, a place must be found.

Now it is clear that a great unsettlement has come over both popular and theological thought in connection with the Atonement, due to various causes, such as a realization of all that was morally indefensible in the statements of the historic theories, a new attitude towards the Bible as an authority for dogma, a changed interpretation of animal sacrifice with a surrender of the idea of a rigid relationship of type and antitype in the Old and the New Testaments. The position cannot be compared with that which obtained before the great constructions were made; it is not possible to return to that time, for the history of the doctrine and all its effects block the way.

What seems to be necessary is a clearing of the ground. It may be possible to arrive at a real measure of unity with regard to the presuppositions underlying the attempt to construct a formal doctrine. Apart from this it is useless to expect anything more than a number of individual repetitions or experiments in the field of dogmatics. And there is grave danger at this point: granted the present theological atmosphere and the present set of religious tendency, there will always be the risk of the most novel theories and the most brilliant exponents obtaining the fullest hearing, and running away with the sympathies of large sections of the Church. And when this happens the Church becomes too much of a debating society and too little of an accredited witness and trustee, which is already in considerable measure the case. A full agreement as to presuppositions is out of the question; on the lines of Dr. Rashdall's book hardly any common ground is to be found between Abelardianism as there expounded and interpreted, and any objective view. Dr. Rashdall writes as one convinced that here is a case of either . . . or.

But if Dr. Rashdall does not persuade us to make the clean sweep of objective soteriology which he has done, we are back in the undoubted difficulty of discovering a unity of formula which shall bear witness to a unity of doctrine, which, in its turn, shall testify to a common judgment and consequent progress at the various points at which possible roads divide. Now it is true enough that past history suggests the great difficulty of anything like a satisfactory unity of formula; and because that is the lesson of past history, unity of formula, in itself, is not something which appears to me to matter much; in Christology, where the history has been very different, unity of formula does matter. But it would be intolerable if we were forced to say that because we can have no unity of formula we can have no unity of doctrine, and because we can have no unity of doctrine we can have no unity in our judgment upon and choice of the several roads which offer themselves. So what I would propose to do is to start from the other end, and try to see where

unity of background or presuppositions is obtainable, and, to some extent, realized among all who hold to the objective theory; the establishment of such unity, as representing no temporal alliance among schools of theology in the face of what they all would regard as a common attack, but the conviction that the objective theory is grounded in principles of unchanging validity, would mean a great improvement on the present situation.

Firstly, then, as to the moral character of the world-order. It is obvious that the work of Christ will have a close relationship to that character. According to the needs which seem to emerge when the world-order is morally valued, so will it be reasonable to see in that earthly climax of the self-revelation of God in Christ something which takes account of those needs, and leaves them no longer just what they were before. Among those needs is the desire for a revelation that in the struggle between good and evil God does not play the part of a neutral, but on the contrary guarantees the final triumph of Good. If it is asked why this should not be left to the future, to a revelation to be made in a final Day of the Lord, the answer is that the moral character of the world-order and its final issue is something which concerns moral personalities now; for the question which is present with us is, In what sort of a world are we now living? Now this world includes many moral experiences of a tragic and evil kind; sin and guilt and their wages in suffering and punishment are actual facts. What is there to set against them? Repentance, moral betterment, the chastening and purgative results of suffering and punishment. But these experiences do not seem sufficient to give assurance of moral victory already present in the world-order, of an end in the future which cannot possibly fail to be attained: they do not confer security. That is, I will not say established in the only way, but best established on the basis of something in which complete moral victory is already present as an achievement which can never be reversed. The idea of a "finished work" is no valueless and immoral notion. A work in which the whole struggle between good and evil could be gathered up, and a settlement made which should create a new moral situation, would be inestimably valuable. That there is this morally creative power in the death of Christ regarded as objective atonement, which has its bearing, not only upon the individual in stimulating love and repentance, but upon the world-order in making it other than it was, sealing it as secured for a goodness which has come victoriously out of the strife with evil, is a judgment which at least tries to do justice to the facts. And as to every word which has been technically used to describe the work of Christ as atoning, "satisfaction," "reparation," "penal suffering," "expiation," we may approach them with the desire to know whether and how far they can find a

place in a construction of the moral order of the world which is in no respect mere theory, but theory working in close relation to the moral experiences of mankind. And I think we may emphasize this —that the conception of the death of Christ as objective atonement, that is, as a finished work, is not a nonsensical conception which has its place only in an unreal universe, nor can any valid moral indictment be brought against it. Whatever may be said against certain ways of construing the objective work of Christ, the objection does not shatter the basis of the interpretation of the world-order, on which all those constructions depend. There are grounds on which the belief that in point of fact Christ's death was objective atonement, a "finished work," may be attacked, but I cannot see that it is properly arguable that if the belief is a true belief, it does not elevate our whole conception of the moral character of the world-order and God's action in respect of it.

Secondly, every doctrine of objective atonement implies a particular understanding of Christ's earthly ministry; that understanding will necessarily be affected by the belief in Christ as Messiah and Son of God. Now it does not appear extravagant to say that granted that belief, an interpretation of the death of Christ must be found which is not only intelligible in relation to the development of the historical situation in which it takes its place, but is also intelligible in relation to the counsels of God. In other words, we are bound, as St. Peter on the day of Pentecost was bound, to say more than that Jesus Christ was slain by the hands of wicked men: St. Peter spoke of His death as happening by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God: this agrees with the declaration of Christ Himself, that it was necessary for Himself to suffer many things and be crucified. To find a necessity, which has its roots in God's express will, for the death of One to Whom the name of Son of God uniquely belongs, may involve a difficult search, but it is a search entirely reasonable in itself. Even if, apart from the theology of St. Paul, the Early Church expressed itself with regard to the death of Christ in traditional formulæ which rested upon the use of a prophetical passage, and, apart from that, concentrated attention rather on the moral fruits of the Christian life, that by no means implies that the Church was unconscious of a divine necessity for Christ's passion. A coherent understanding of the earthly life and ministry of our Lord is, I allow, less easy when a sharp division is made, in the fashion of one tradition in the old dogmatic, between the active obedience of the ministry of work, with its doing of the will of God, and the passive obedience of the suffering upon the Cross. A passive consummation of an active ministry does present a difficulty. But just at this point the clearer vision which one associates with the writings of Dr. Forsyth helps us to correct this

fault, by its perception of the real activity present in the Cross, the activity of a will set upon the confession of God's holiness in the midst of and throughout the endurance of suffering. This conception of Christ's active obedience does not, of course, involve a theory of objective atonement; it is compatible with theories of quite a different kind, but it can be held along with that objective view, and wards off the objection that when that view is held, Christ's work on earth is not regarded as, so to speak, all of one piece. I can understand the objection which is felt to such a standpoint as might be expressed in words like "Christ came into the world to die"; but the force of the objection disappears if it is said "Christ came into the world to do the Father's will; that will involved His death." The death of Christ then takes its place as at once the climax of His active ministry, and, at the same time, as that new fact in which was adjusted the relationship between the holiness of God and the world's moral evil.

Then, thirdly, the death of Christ, conceived of as objective atonement, holds a unique place in connection both with systematic theology and with Christian experience. And if one calls it not only unique but vital, that means no judgment upon individuals who take the matter quite differently. One is thinking of the Church as a whole, and of the possibilities of the future. What systematic theology needs is an adequate centre, and an adequate doctrine of final causes. It is concerned with God in respect of His action, and not simply of His being. And the action of God must be presented in an intelligible form, and as seeking particular ends. Now it is clear enough that what God seeks in relation to free personalities is a kingdom of good wills. We can hardly recall too often that most profound saying of Kant's that nothing within the world or outside it can be thought of as completely good, except a good will. But the idea of a kingdom of good wills does not shut out the idea of objective atonement, unless the action of God is conceived of as related merely to the future, operating through such inducements and helps as may seem to Him most serviceable for the moral end in view. In that case, such an action of God as is given in the doctrine of the Incarnation cannot be regarded as more than exemplary. But in that case, God's moral action on the world is limited by the extent to which the example which He has provided rouses men to the true moral life; and the defect of this result is that the moral centre of the world is not to be found in the action of God, but in the action of man. There is nothing equal to the grandeur of the old soteriology which held to a moral centre of the world called into existence by the action of God Himself working directly upon the whole moral situation, restoring its broken order as well as supplying new motives and powers for the future. To some extent it may be

a valid complaint against the old systematic theologies that they inclined to emphasize the metaphysical rather than the ethical, a doctrine of substance rather than of action. But in so far as that was the case, it was not due to their objective soteriologies; these contained an implicit correction of such weaknesses, for an atonement which reveals in itself the moral action of God must throw light upon all other parts of the dogmatic scheme, if only it is treated with an understanding of its central position. And at a time when the notion of a struggling, suffering God, crude and unsatisfying as it is, shows how much is felt the need for a God whose relation to the world shall be in some sense one of moral action, it would be a profound mistake to belittle a doctrine which sets the whole Christian revelation in the light of what God has done for the supreme moral purpose of a holy kingdom.

That the objective doctrine has been linked up with one great type of Christian experience would not be denied. One cannot say that either has been the creator of the other: certainly it is not right to say that experience has produced the doctrine by way of an immediate delivery of the Christian conscience. But it is not unfair to say that if the objective doctrine were thoroughly discarded, the Church would be the poorer by the loss of some of the most strengthening and comforting experiences which ever come to Christian souls; and, more than that, an unique experience would disappear from the world. For the Church's appeal to the world is again and again made on the basis of the children's hymn, and it is not so easy to replace an appeal of that kind. If we had to stop singing—

> There was no other good enough
> To pay the price of sin;
> He only could unlock the gate
> Of heaven and let us in,

we should be inevitably condemning as untrue (however defensible in the conditions of other days), not only the form but the substance of the Church's evangelizing and converting ministry. Christian experience is varied; one ought to beware of attempting to stretch the consciences and the feelings of all alike upon a Procrustean bed with which these must exactly correspond; but it is not improper to give weight to those experiences of forgiveness through the blood of Christ in which the Christian message, as a Gospel for sinful and guilty men, has come home so powerfully to unnumbered multitudes.

That the idea of atonement in any form which allows us to speak of a finished work introduces us to a region of profound mystery is certain. Yet it is none the less true that in the same idea is found an extraordinarily simple religious appeal. The elimination of the element of mystery would lead to no strengthening of that appeal.

We have learnt to discard modes of expression that were intellectually and morally indefensible, and that is all to the good: we are legitimately suspicious of too great rigidity in theory, and of concentration upon any one formula. But we have no cause to be ashamed if we go on to say that neither intellect nor conscience compels us to cut ourselves off from the faith which saw an objective Godward value in the Cross of Christ, and that the heart which has its reasons bears witness that that is true.

J. K. Mozley.

THE PRELIMINARY WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER AT GENEVA

I

Geneva will always remain in my mind as the place where, contrary to the expectations which arose from its associations, I gained some idea as to what a reunited Christendom might practically mean, and where I came first in contact with the intense conviction, the acute intelligence and the wonderful devotion of the Eastern Church. I may say at once that, in my opinion, the Conference has accomplished far more than the most sanguine hopes of its originators ever anticipated, and that it has succeeded in accomplishing so much just because it aimed at so little. If I may use a military illustration, it was no wild rush into the enemy's country, no sensational capture of positions which would have had later to be abandoned with serious loss of prestige, but a calm, very slow and deliberate advance to a carefully thought out and intentionally restricted objective, which in time will form the starting-point for a greater and still more carefully prepared advance. In one sense the whole result of the Conference was the appointment of a Continuation Committee representing in its membership, and in rough proportion to its numerical importance, every considerable group of Churches except the Roman Catholic Church, which declined the invitation to share in the Conference, and a decision that this Committee, meeting annually, should try to obtain from the various Churches represented an answer to certain very simple but fundamental questions on Faith and on Order. The form of these questions is chiefly due to the Bishop of Bombay, but they emerged naturally out of the discussions of the Conference. It will be sufficient to give those on Faith, as it was suggested that these should be submitted first by themselves, and then parallel ones on the ministry later. When the answers are received the Committee will endeavour to co-ordinate them, and, if necessary, resubmit them in a co-ordinated form, and thus prepare for the World Conference to be held in a few years' time.

Questions concerning the Faith of the Reunited Church.

1. What degree of unity in Faith will be necessary in a reunited Church?

2. Is a statement of this one Faith in the form of a Creed necessary or desirable?

3. If so, what Creed should be used or what other formulary would be desired?

4. What are the proper uses of a Creed or confession of faith?

It may be said that this, together with the general approval given by the Conference to certain proposals made by the Holy Orthodox Church, and supported by the Armenian Church, was a small result for so much expenditure of time and money, but this is not really so.

In the first place, the Conference was for the first time really representative of the whole of Christendom, with the sole exception of the Roman Communion. Forty countries and eighty Churches were officially represented by their chosen delegates. It is to be regretted that the Church of England in England was so inadequately represented by one non-diocesan bishop and one priest. It is true that Bishop Gore is a host in himself, and that no one in the Conference carried greater weight or was more eagerly listened to; it is true that the Bishop of Winchester was appointed and would have been present but for ill-health, but even then it cannot be said that the great Church of England was adequately or properly represented, nor was the Anglican Communion in the United States represented, except by the President, Secretary, and Bishop McKim of Japan. Fortunately, the Anglican Communion, as a whole, was well in evidence owing to the fact that their attendance at the Lambeth Conference gave an opportunity to many overseas bishops to be present. Ireland was represented by the Bishop of Ossory, Scotland by the Bishop of St. Andrews, Japan by Bishop Cecil and Mr. Motada, Canada by the Bishops of Montreal and Huron, South Africa by Bishop Nash of Capetown and the Bishop of St. John's Kaffraria, China by the Bishop of North China, India by the Bishop of Bombay and Rev. W. E. S. Holland, Central America by the Bishop of Honduras, and Australia by the Bishop of Willochra. The Eastern Orthodox Church was very capably represented by Eulogius Archbishop of Volhynia, Evangelidis Archbishop of Nubia, Kyriakides Archbishop of Pelusium, Strinopoulos Metropolitan of Seleucia, the courteous and most popular Irenæus, Bishop of Timok in Serbia, and by a number of lesser dignitaries, from Bulgaria, Greece, Roumania, and other parts of the East. Two bishops represented Armenia. The Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, Lutherans, and Congregationalists of Europe and America were all strongly represented, as well as the German Evangelicals. The Old Catholics had two bishops, including

the Venerable Bishop Herzog, and one or two minor sects were perhaps over fully represented. Archbishop Söderblom of Sweden had unfortunately to leave after two days. On the whole, the gathering was really world-representative, with the one exception which, as the President said, we all deplored but refused to accept as final.

What was the spirit of this great gathering? It was, in one word, Christian. There was a wonderful spirit of fellowship and mutual consideration which grew from day to day, as we came to know and to understand each other better. There was no attempt to gain a victory or to score a point. There was a real desire to understand what lay behind our neighbours' forms and practices, and to explain our own in a way that they could understand. There was, I think, no desire to arrive at a minimum formula upon which all could agree. It would not be quite true to say that there was never anything said that could possibly cause offence. One or two of the Scotch Presbyterians put their views of the value of Presbyterianism and the minus value of the Catholic creeds with an incisiveness which was perhaps due to the desire to put much into a brief time, and our German friends have not yet altogether attained the art of conciliatory speech, but such occasions were very few and far between and never of real importance, and were matters rather of manner than substance. It is very possible that the Anglican presentment of the Catholic case seemed to some, at least, as much overemphasized. On the whole, it was certainly true, as the President said, that there had been no unreal and no jarring note. Time was a real difficulty. There were four official languages—English, French, German, and Greek. The latter was only used occasionally, and the German translation was either waived or given in a separate room, but everything had to be translated into French, and in the case of short notices and speeches often into German, so that at least half our time was lost, save that we all improved our French. The chief interpreter did wonders, and entered most intelligently and sympathetically into his work. Perhaps this slowness was not altogether an evil, for it made men think before they spoke, and checked unnecessary verbiage. It would be difficult to overestimate the value to the Conference of the impressive personality and slow, measured procedure of the Chairman, Bishop Brent. Over and over again his impassive deliberation and ready wit saved a difficult situation, and he never for an instant allowed the Conference to forget the great spiritual issues that lay behind all its acts and words.

Undoubtedly the most striking and most important feature of the Conference was the presence and hearty co-operation of the important representatives of the Orthodox Church. The very sight of these Easterns, with their flowing robes and quaint headgear, was a sign and symbol of things that are yet to be. To some of our

more Protestant members it was altogether a new and startling experience to be sitting, talking, working, praying, and consulting for the common good with ecclesiastics in episcopal robes, wearing gold chains and magnificent pectoral crosses; it was still more startling to them to find themselves present officially at a magnificent Eucharist, with clouds of incense and priests and bishops in copes of extraordinary magnificence and beauty, engaged in mystic worship which, as the President said, carried us back into the atmosphere of the Apocalypse, and they were frankly puzzled by the discovery that the Sacred Book in a most magnificent binding, adorned with costly jewels, was kissed and knelt before and reverenced in the service in a way that went far beyond the wildest dreams of the staunchest advocate of "the Bible and the Bible only the religion of Protestants."

But it was not only the extreme Protestants who found they had much to learn from the Eastern Orthodox Church. The Archbishop of Volhynia described the terrible persecution of the Russian Church, but told us how in the very hour of its agony the Church had reformed itself and come into a new and intimate relation with the people; we remembered the great debt which, *pace* Dr. Anderson Scott, we owed to the great Greek Fathers, so much more modern, so much more human than the Latin Fathers, whose influence and whose narrow logic still mould the theology even of those who most violently oppose them; we remembered how the Christians under Mohammedan rule had endured centuries of persecution, when to deny Christ would have ensured peace and prosperity; we found in the Eastern prelates and professors men of keen intellect, awake to new ideals and bent on progress, as well as men who had the secret of a beauty and a devotion in worship which was to most of us a revelation, and even those whose communions had been most guilty of it were moved by their protest against proselytizing, and by their appeal for the sympathy of their fellow-Christians in their sufferings and persecutions. It is no small thing to have brought the representatives of 300,000,000 Eastern Christians into close and brotherly contact, not only with the Anglican, but with the Protestant Christians of the West, and this is what the World Conference has done.

One other point seems to require notice. I could not resist the impression that the real point at issue in the Conference, the real line of division that sundered its members, had little or nothing to do with the divisions of Christians at all. Behind the question of a Creed lay the question of the Creed. Bishop Gore seemed to me to touch the point when he said that behind the rejection of the Creed lay the rejection of the Incarnation. No doubt the claim to reinterpret the Creed to one's generation is a right, an honest, and an entirely Christian claim, but one could not but feel how easily it might pass into the claim to reject all authority, and practically, if

not in set terms, to deny the fundamentals of the Christian Faith. It was here that the tremendous emphasis of the Easterns on the Nicene Creed was felt to be a strength and the vagueness of certain Westerns to be a very serious cause of weakness. It will be useless to have a reunited Church unless that Church is going to be a Christian Church. One necessary word of warning was given. So far the movement has been financially possible because of the generosity of two Americans, father and son. That this should continue is neither seemly nor possible. Printing, postage, secretarial, travelling, and other Continuation expenses will amount to at least £10,000 a year, and if the work of preparation for the World Conference is to be adequately performed during the two or three years that must elapse before it meets, then this amount must be provided by the Christian Church, not a large sum for such an object, and one that takes no account of the enormous voluntary services of the Hon. Secretary and other workers. As the President truly said, no one can foretell to-day what the results or ultimate issue of the Conference will be, but to those who were present at least it was a time of vision and a season of hopes which they dare not limit.

GILBERT WHITE,

Bishop of Willochra, South Australia; a Vice-President of the Conference and one of the Anglican Representatives on the Continuation Committee.

II

GENEVA,
August 20, 1920.

IT may be doubted whether even this city of Conferences has ever received a more remarkable gathering than that which held its sessions here from the 12th to the 19th inst. The Athenæum, where it met, was itself an omen of success, having been the birthplace in 1865 of the Red Cross Society of Geneva. Even more sacred was our aim—the healing of the rents in the Body of Christ, the yielding to Him of a Church so united that the world shall believe. And the gathering was not unworthy of the end. One great section, indeed, of the Catholic Church was unrepresented: what the Chairman, Bishop Brent, described as "the venerable Church of Rome." But the Orthodox Church of the East was there in full force—the Archbishop of Seleucia representing the Patriarch of Constantinople, the Patriarch of Alexandria and the Archbishop of Nubia representative prelates from Serbia and Bulgaria. A Russian refugee, the Archbishop of Volhynia, explained the unwilling absence of an elected delegation from his sorely afflicted Church; the Armenian Church sent a young and active prelate, Dr. Abel. Not less notable was the contingent from Scandinavia, the vigorous Archbishop of Upsala, Bishop Ostenfeld from Denmark. The Anglican Churches gave us our Chairman, Bishop Brent, the originator of the whole effort; the

admirable Secretary, Mr. R. Gardiner; Bishop Gore, who soon became the leading spirit of the Conference; the Bishops of Bombay, Ossory, St. Andrews (Scotland), North China, North Tokio, Kaffraria, Honduras, and others. Presbyterianism was represented by Dr. Park (Belfast), Chairman of the Pan-Presbyterian Alliance; Professors Cooper, Curtis, and Kay, and Dr. McClyment from the Church of Scotland; Professor Cairns and Dr. Fergan of the United Free Church of Scotland; Dr. Anderson Scott and Dr. Ramsay of the English Presbyterian Church; Professor Alexius de Boer and Dr. Szabo of Hungary; Mr. Ruppeldt and Dr. Zilka of Czechoslovakia. English Wesleyanism supplied a most popular vice-chairman in Dr. Tasker; English Congregationalism an eloquent speaker in Professor Vernon Bartlet; the English Baptists sent Dr. Roberts; the Quakers were characteristically represented by a lady, Miss Lucy Jones. The vast variety of American communions contributed a large contingent, and among the speeches which will live in the recollection of the hearers will certainly be that of Dr. Ainslie of the Disciples of Christ, a Church which has taken a foremost place in the movement.

It was something that we looked each other in the face; it was more that we recognized each other as brothers in Christ; that no word of bitterness passed the lips of any; that, as the President remarked, there was not a note of insincerity in the whole proceedings. The difficulties were not blinked. But there was complete unanimity of determination that the work must go on; and the most important thing that the Conference did was the appointment of a carefully selected Continuation Committee to prepare for the holding, within the next few years if possible, of the Conference for which this meeting was assembled to prepare.

Where will it meet? It was with profound emotion that a letter was read from the Œcumenical Patriarch of Jerusalem, inviting it to assemble in the Holy City—the birthplace of the Christian Church.

What will it say when it does meet? Bishop Gore put searching questions upon this point; at present one can only remark that the Lambeth Conference has made the prospect of a solution very much brighter; that where there is the will there is generally the way; and that our help is not in ourselves, but in Him Whose we are and Whom we serve. We separated in thankfulness and hope, pledged each in his own sphere to do his utmost to advance the cause.

It would be unpardonable to omit the august and profoundly beautiful service in the Russian Church at Geneva, which, on the last morning of our meeting, the Conference officially attended. Bishop Brent expressed what many of us felt: "It was like the Apocalypse: the East has much to give to the West, and the West in like manner to the East."

JAMES COOPER.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

The report of the Bishop of Chelmsford's Presidential Address at the Church Congress only reaches us as we go to press, and comment therefore is impossible in the present number. It is obviously a pronouncement of great importance; and it would not perhaps be unreasonable to discern in it some of the issues discussed at the recent Conference held at Cuddesdon between representatives of the Episcopate and members of the Continuation Committee of the Anglo-Catholic Congress. The Church of England could do no greater service to truth or unity than by setting its own house in order; and the Bishop of Chelmsford's proposals to this end, bold, constructive, and far-reaching as they are, deserve the most careful study.

An extraordinary dramatic beauty attaches to Dr. Sanday's Nunc Dimittis, which has just been published by the Faith Press under the title of *The Position of Liberal Theology*. It is far more than a reply to the Bishop of Zanzibar's Open Letter, entitled "The Christ and His Critics"—more even than a brief, yet careful, outline of what "liberal" theology stands for. For it reveals with complete simplicity the character of its author; and it was such a character as to provoke the reverent emulation of every student. Few who have been protagonists in great controversies can have had less to regret in the conduct of their warfare than Dr. Sanday; and, deeply as he felt the issues involved, there is no word of anger or hardness or over-statement in this last work which he might have wished unwritten.

"I wish to say this," he writes: ". . . I feel that the days of my intellectual pilgrimage are over. For good or for ill, I believe that I have found as much in the way of general principle as I could expect to find. My barque has sailed into port. Whatever may happen to the body, the mind at least is at rest. There are no inner contradictions.

"How much that may mean is another question. I repeat that the result is the merest outline. For years I have felt that I have been trying (as I put it to myself) 'to make both ends meet'; and now I feel that, so far as it is in my power to make them, they have met."

Happy indeed the man who can write so at the end of his life's course. *Requiescat : illuminetur : fructificetur.*

We are glad to publish this month a review by the Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, of Dr. Rendel Harris's last edition of *The Odes of Solomon*. Dr. Bernard's own edition, which appeared in *Texts and Studies* in 1912, has contributed more perhaps than any other work to the elucidation of these earliest extant Christian hymns. Apart from their poetic excellence, their evidential value for the living experience of the worshipping community in the second century is of unique importance; and, whatever be the final judgment as to their date, they are bound to have strong reactions upon other fields of theology—such, for example, as the study of St. John.

We do not know whether any attempt has yet been made to turn these Odes into English verse. The task would be difficult, but abundantly

worth while, supplying us with a collection of hymns for use at Baptisms, and still more at Confirmations, of imperishable beauty. The Scottish Metrical Psalter, and such hymns of our own as "The King of Love my Shepherd is" (A. & M., 197)—or George Herbert's version set for Refreshment Sunday in the English Hymnal, 93—show how the difficulties may be surmounted. If any should be inspired to make the venture, we should be glad to find space for any successful results in this journal. We cannot but think—to make only one suggestion—that there are some masters of classical scholarship at our Public Schools who could achieve the result by turning the Odes first into Latin or Greek, and thence into English.

The decision of the "Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches" to appoint a strong committee to examine and report on the Resolutions and Appeal of the Lambeth Conference on Reunion may prove to be of great moment. Nonconformist criticism of the proposals has tended to harden during the last few weeks—a fact which need not be wondered at, nor indeed regretted, provided that there is agreement as to the end, and steadfastness in pursuing it. The temptation is to give rein to impatience, until we realize how vast and world-wide are the issues, and that they are part of the counsels of One with whom "a thousand years are but as yesterday." Providence may design some swifter cohesion of the severed members of the Church than we can know of; but, so far as human opinion and human action are concerned, *festina lente* is an indispensable motto.

"IN THE SPIRIT"

Dominus Illuminatio.

"Out of the deep have I called unto Thee, O Lord."—PSALM CXXX. 1.

DEEP calleth unto deep, the soul to God and God to the soul; and we have experience of that intimate touch and profound understanding of love which results from that call which is also the going forth of love to meet love. There is no call of love on our part which is not met by a call from Him. But if we call to Him for the succours of His love, He calls to us to give ourselves wholly to Him, since we cannot have our hearts' desire unless we first satisfy Him. His call to us is that we may find in Him the truth of all we are to Him, and know that we are loved. It would seem that we cannot know the secret of His love towards us except we first give ourselves. The call of the soul out of its depths is then something more than an appeal to God in the depths of His love; it is also the cry of abandonment. If we seek satisfaction in the fulness of Divine love we must find it in the mystical loss of the self in the abyss of that love. Only as we are wholly abandoned to it will it perfectly enclose us. That is the satisfaction we desire and which it is God's will to give us. As every need of the soul is ultimately a need of God, so every cry by which it is expressed is a cry from the deep of our love to Him. This is true of every impulse which ends in a cry to God; but the cry may arise from mystic depths which are only understood by the soul in its most secret consciousness. Such is the cry of one whom God is leading through the deepest ways of discipline to some desired pureness of love. Truly that one may say: "Out of the deep have I called unto Thee, O Lord. Lord, hear my voice."

X.

Oremus.

[This month we print two prayers for the Departed, and one for the Peace of the World, in case they may prove useful for All Souls' and Armistice Days. Next month we are anxious to find good collects for Times of Unrest, such as may be suitable for use in our Irish or labour troubles; in the January number, prayers for Education.

We are grateful to all who have sent contributions, and ask for more.]

Commemoration of the Departed.

Almighty and eternal God, Who art God not of the dead, but of the living; pour forth, we beseech Thee, upon the souls of [those who have laid down their lives for their brethren and upon] all the faithful departed the splendour of Thy light, and the wealth of Thy love; that, being cleansed from every stain of sin, they may be found worthy to behold the King in His beauty, and to enter into the joy of their Lord; Who liveth and reigneth, etc.

Source: Original.

Almighty and everlasting God, the source of all being and life, whose mercies are infinite, and whose love is unceasing; to Thee we commend all souls departed in Thy faith and fear, praying Thee to cleanse them from every taint and trace of sin, that in the communion of Saints they may find the joy and peace of a perfect life; through the merits of the one only Redeemer of us all, Jesus Christ our Lord.

Source: From Dr. Orchard's *Divine Service* (Milford), slightly adapted.

For the Kingdom of Peace.

Eternal God, in whose perfect Kingdom no sword is drawn but the sword of righteousness, and no strength known but the strength of love; we pray Thee so mightily to shed and spread abroad Thy Spirit, that, casting away vain enmity, greed, self-will, and the bondage of sin, all peoples and ranks may be gathered in one army, the Lord of Hosts', as children of one Father, Lord of Love; through Jesus Christ Thy Son, Who died for our peace, and now liveth and reigneth with Thee and the same Spirit, one God, for ever and ever.

Source: Original, suggested by Donne, Sermon XIX.

We have received the following valuable note, with others which we shall use presently, on the Collect "*Remember, Lord, what Thou hast wrought*," etc., from Dr. Feltoe.

This "war-time" collect was one of the best issued, 1914-18, to my mind, and it is significant that it is from an ancient source—viz., as Mr. Lockton has pointed out to me, from *Leon. Sacr.* (p. 126, Feltoe=429 Mur.): Memento Dnē quod es operatus in nobis et non quid mereamur sed conlati gratiam tui muneris intuere ut sicut me sacris altaribus tua dignatio pontificali servire præcipit officio, ita dignum præstet et merito. (Obviously an episcopal prayer.) I should like to know who adapted it so finely.

The Word in Action.

Heroism. II.—In the Mission Field.

συνκακοπάθησον ὡς καλὸς στρατιώτης Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ.—2 Tim. ii. 3.

συνκακοπάθησον. It is a fellowship, an array, a noble army. Heb. xi. could be rewritten from the annals of the foreign mission field: the like of many a modern "minister of Christ" is foreshadowed in 2 Cor. xi. 23 and following. The day of ridicule for the threadbare black-coated figure, hymn-book in hand, easy prey to cannibals, is past. But the privations and the perils continue. It is ultimately the attraction of hardship that keeps the gospel trenches manned; but the line is a thin one at best, and every missionary diocese is crying out for priests and women workers.

Past, too, or passing, is the day of unnatural separation between the Church's operations at home and overseas. But the physical separation remains: "And now, behold, I know that ye all, among whom I went about preaching the Kingdom, shall see my face no more"—even if it be actually less grim than

> "Atqui sciebat quæ sibi barbarus
> Tortor pararet."

So, and almost to the same spot as Regulus, did the aged Raymond Lull go back to die in N. Africa in 1315. Or take a modern instance: prophetic words written home by an American missionary before the Boxer outbreak: "If you never see me again, remember that I am not sorry I have come to China. Whether I have saved anyone or not He knows, but it was for Him, and we go to Him." This *isolation* is of three kinds:

(*a*) Sheer loneliness in a strange land. Readers of the *Church Times* may remember a letter signed "One from the Homeland" in their issue of August 20, 1920, and will have pardoned the touch of bitterness in the sturdy soul who sees the promised release and even furlough from his post in S. Africa receding further and further as one by one the others refuse to "stick it" and take their leave.

(*b*) Official indifference. It seems sometimes as though the Imperial Government, in its anxiety to be impartial, is positively and deliberately discouraging to representatives of the imperial faith—*e.g.*, India, Ceylon, and Australia. The diplomatic fatuities which followed the murder of Arthur Douglas in Central Africa by a Portuguese corporal in 1911 may doubtless be traced to the same policy. But for Christians brought up in an Established Church the lesson that spiritual truth will best endure where temporal authority has been least employed to propagate or maintain it is hard to learn—unless they are familiar with the annals of Spain in S. America, or of Portugal, even apart from the Inquisition, in India (read *S. Francis Xavier*, by Edith A. Stewart, Headley Bros.). The success of Islam lies rather in the system which follows acceptance of the Prophet, than in the threat which may or may not have enforced it.

But this is straying somewhat far from the fact that the foreign missionary even in British Dominions will be tempted in his solitude to feel that the land of his birth accords him no special treatment, unless his work be of unique educational or pacific value, and will not declare war simply because he is murdered. But at any rate we have said good-bye to the days of "John Company," for instance, when no man calling himself a missionary was allowed to land, and William Carey had to enter as an indigo planter and later to bring his first helpers through a Danish port.

(*c*) Spiritual isolation. We speak half-seriously of the non-Christian character of England, but the soil on which we live and the buildings in which we pray are at least hallowed by centuries of devotion in the past. Any missionary from Africa or the Far East will testify to the oppressive sense of evil in heathen surroundings. Does Eph. vi. 12 refer to the shadow of coming persecution, or to the subtle atmosphere of a pagan civilization ?

But just as Bruce Bairnsfather and Ian Hay have taught us that there is comedy even in modern warfare " against flesh and blood," so there are plenty of missionary chronicles which dwell on the lighter side without being pawky or trivial. Read *An Outpost in Papua*, by A. K. Chignell, and don't miss the solemn apologia on p. 354. Happy the writer with Bishop G. A. Selwyn's gift of illustrating such drolleries with his pencil ! If Luke *was* artist as well as physician, may we imagine a lost leaf of his diary ending " Here is a ship of Adramyttium with one of us " ?

ὡς καλὸς στρατιώτης. Let us sum up by comparing the two warfares:

(1) It is a *fellowship* (*supra*). No missionary is really alone. *Esprit de corps :* Does the reader know Stephen Graham's book, *A Private in the Guards?*

(2) But it does entail lonely posts and thoughts of home (Phil. i. 24).

(3) And renunciation (2 Tim. ii. 4).

(4) The soldier *sings* on active service (Mark xiv. 26, Acts xvi. 25, Ephes, v. 19).

(5) The soldier's *pay* varies in inverse proportion to the danger: so does the evangelist's—at home as well as abroad.

(6) The element of *surprise*—even deception ? (2 Cor. vi. 8)—common to soldiers, fishermen (Matt. iv. 19) and diplomatists (2 Cor. v. 20). But cp. also 2 Cor. iv. 2. The Gospel bravely proclaimed will come as news, with something of a shock.

(7) *Volunteers* or conscripts ? See the official Report on the Missionary Work of the Church, § 97—*e.g.*, " The whole question [of recruiting] is ultimately bound up with vocation and the call to service for the Kingdom." But what will happen to Paul if he preach not the Gospel ?

(8) The Epistles are the *training* manuals of the Church militant, the Acts are its official *history*. In this connection see Report on the Teaching Office of the Church, p. 43, paragraph on Church History and Missionary Study. Paul, scholar and hero, possessed that irresistible combination of brains and courage: " He Who taught as one having authority and confuted the scribes on their own ground, fasted forty days, and endured the pains of crucifixion."

Y.

REVIEWS

THE ODES AND PSALMS OF SOLOMON. Re-edited by Rendel Harris and Alphonse Mingana. Vol. I. (1916). Text and Facsimiles. 10s. 6d. net. Vol. II. (1920). Introduction, Translation, and Notes. Manchester: University Press. 21s. net.

THE "Odes of Solomon," which were discovered eleven years ago in Syriac by Dr. Rendel Harris, have been the subject of much learned discussion throughout Europe and America since the publication of the *editio princeps* in 1909. They are poems of rare beauty and strike a high spiritual note, but they are difficult to interpret, and the religious ideas which they presuppose are expressed in language which is not sufficiently explicit to determine readily the theological standpoint of the author. Harnack thought them to be Jewish with Christian interpolations, and it was some time before it was fully recognized, as it is now, that they are distinctively Christian hymns. As to their date, it is admitted by all scholars that they are not earlier than A.D. 70, and not later than 180; but within these limits there is still difference of opinion as to the time of their composition, and the habits of Christian life which they reveal.

For his new edition of the Odes (which is produced under the auspices of the John Rylands' Library), Dr. Harris has had the assistance of Dr. Alphonse Mingana, an accomplished Syriac scholar, and the thoroughness and care with which the text has been examined leave nothing to be desired. The much debated problem as to the original language of the Odes has been discussed in all its bearings; and the conclusion has been reached (in this departing from the view upheld in the *editio princeps*) that the Syriac text is not a mere rendering of a Greek original, but that it is itself the original, of which a Greek version was afterwards made. In my edition of the Odes (published in 1912), I urged that this was the most probable view, but I was not able to prove it, as Harris and Mingana have now done by an exhaustive linguistic study. That the Odes are all from the same hand, and that theories of interpolation are unnecessary, may now be regarded as established.

In the *editio princeps*, Harris took the view that the Odes were private songs of the Spirit, the exulting praise of a thankful heart; but he is now prepared to consider the possibility of their use in public worship. They form a "Christian hymn book"; "it appears that the text was sung in the Churches, or in some devotional meetings, of the Western Syrians." I went a little further in my edition, and claimed that "they are not private poems, but that they were intended for liturgical use." And I pointed out that in the Syriac *Testamentum Domini* one of the rubrics for the morning office ran: "Let them sing *psalms*, and four *hymns of praise*; one by Moses,

and of *Solomon*, and of the other prophets." Harris will not allow that there is any reference here to our Odes; and he says that the rubric, which mentions Solomon, " is, probably, nothing more than an injunction to sing the 72nd Psalm, whose heading is *A Psalm of Solomon*." But he has not noticed that in the rubric a distinction is drawn between *psalms* and *hymns of praise* of Moses and Solomon and the prophets—*i.e.*, between the Canonical Psalter and the ᾠδαί of the Eastern Church, which are appended to some MSS. of the Septuagint. It seems to me fairly certain that we have here a trace of that use of the *Odes* in public worship in the Syrian Church which Harris himself recognizes as probable.

I pass on to consider the arguments which our editors adduce for a first-century date for these beautiful poems. They form " a Christian book of hymns written in or on the borders of the first century " (p. 138), and probably in the neighbourhood of Antioch (p. 69). It is likely enough that they are of Antiochene origin, but when we come to examine the proofs of a first-century date, I own that I am not convinced. In the *editio princeps* Harris argued that the language of Ode iv. implied that the Jewish Temple was either still standing or had very recently been an object of reverent affection. To this view, as he now says, " there was a chorus of objection. It was maintained, and with much justice, that the Temple of Ode iv., which could not be replaced or displaced, was spiritual and not local, and that it stood either for the Christian believer or for the Christian Church; and if this objection were valid, then the supposed historical landmark had disappeared, at least as far as Ode iv. is concerned " (p. 199). Thus " we may have to admit that the Temple is gone " (p. 198). And he seems to recognize, in his detailed notes on the Ode, that the spiritual interpretation of " the Holy Place " is the true one. He urges, nevertheless, that " the actual Temple is necessary in the explanation of the Ode" in the sense that the Odist uses phrases reminiscent of the Temple Psalms; but that is not sufficient for the inference that the Temple had been standing within a few years of the composition of the Ode.

The new arguments which Dr. Harris brings forward for an early date for these hymns must now be weighed. The most interesting is his endeavour to show that the Odes were known to Ignatius. In Ode xxxviii. mention is made of " the drugs of Error and the plagues of Death, which are thought to be *sweetness*," and a few verses lower down the Deceivers are said to give many " to drink of the wine of their intoxication." Harris urges that the word translated *sweetness* may mean *a sweet drink*, the idea being that of poison disguised by its mixture with such a drink. Now Ignatius (*Trall.* 6) warns the Church against heretics who mingle poison with honey wine (*οἰνομέλιτι*). Here, then, it is said, is an actual quotation

from the Odes by Ignatius. And, again, in Ode xi. the words are found: "*speaking waters* drew near my lips from the fountain of the Lord plenteously." With this is compared ὕδωρ ζῶν καὶ λαλοῦν of Ignatius (*Rom.* 7). Harris connects both these phrases (for he does not agree with Lightfoot that the text of Ignatius is corrupt here) with the "talking waters" of the oracle at Daphne, near Antioch. These arguments are most ingenious, but are they sufficient to carry conviction? To me they seem to provide interesting parallels to the language of the Odes, but no more. The "speaking waters" of Ode xi. may be compared with the Water of the Fountain in Ode xxx., which "flows from the lips of the Lord," both phrases being curious and in need of further illustration; but a reference to the pagan oracles of Antioch seems a little far-fetched. Nor does it seem safe to take the words of Ignatius "Jesus Christ is One" (*Magn.* 7) as a quotation from Ode xli. "the Christ is really One": the words are almost identical, but there is no necessity to assume any literary connection. The argument, in short, from Ignatius is not convincing.

Harris essays to show that Barnabas, as well as Ignatius, knew the Odes of Solomon, but he admits that the parallels which he adduces are not conclusive and they need not be reproduced here, although, like everything else in the way of patristic comment in this fine edition, they are interesting. But space must be found for an examination of the thesis that Bardaisan used the Odes. Harris has come to the conclusion that Ephraim knew them, and there is a great deal of evidence for this, although there are other explanations of some, at least, of the parallels which he adduces. But it is quite another matter to claim that Bardaisan quoted the Odes in the second century. Let us see. Ephraim, who is apparently alluding to the Manichæans or to Bardaisan (whom he calls the teacher of Mani), speaks of some who "say that it is the sun who receives this light from the moon; beautiful are these receivers who receive one from another." Now Ode xvi. 16, 17 has:

> "He made the sun for the day that it might be bright;
> But night brings darkness over the face of the earth:
> And [by] their reception one from the other
> They speak the beauty of God."

There is nothing here of an exchange of illumination between sun and moon, which the Bardaisanians, as reported by Ephraim, taught; nor can we get it without altering the text of the Ode. It is, I submit, quite untrustworthy to build on so slight a verbal parallel; Ps. xix. 1 is much more apposite to quote in this context. Neither can any stress be laid on the circumstance that Bardaisan, like the Odist, somewhere alludes to the fact that it is the work of a sailor to steer a ship; nor on his observation that drunkenness takes

away the memory and deprives a man of responsibility, because the Odist says something similar. There is another passage from Bardaisan, upon which I shall comment presently; but I think it will be recognized, on examination, that the debt of Bardaisan to the Odist is not established.

Once more. A quotation from the Odes of Solomon is found in Lactantius, and in Harris' first edition he concluded that a Latin Version of the Odes must have been in existence before Lactantius' day. This was very improbable, and he now abandons this view. But he puts forward, in its place, the theory that Lactantius was working from a Latin book of O.T. *Testimonia*, which included as if it were Scripture a sentence from the Odes, and that this *Book of Testimonies* must be earlier than the time of Justin Martyr. His argument is that where Lactantius diverges from Cyprian in the appeal to *Testimonia*, "as in the addition of uncanonical matter, it often happens that the divergent and additional matter will be found in Justin Martyr," and that we may conclude, therefore, that "the common origin of *Testimonia* of Lactantius and Cyprian is earlier than the time of Justin." Now it may be true that such a book of *Testimonia* existed at an early date—Dr. Harris has provided elsewhere all the evidence that can be adduced for such a thing—but we doubt if he will find many adherents to his view that the book is "of Apostolic origin" (p. 9). But even if it were used by Lactantius,there is not a scrap of proof anywhere that it contained extracts from the Odes of Solomon. The fragment of uncanonical matter (Ode xix. 6) which Lactantius quotes is not found in Justin Martyr, and there is no reason to suppose that he got it from a Testimony Book at all. Lactantius is fond of quoting from non-canonical writings, and (as I wrote in 1912) "the Odes would have been quite in his line of study." We cannot push back the date of the Odes by an appeal to a Book of O.T. Testimonies, as Harris would have us do, for even if such a book existed in the second century there is no evidence that one of its *testimonia* was a passage which is found in the Odes of Solomon.

Another principal argument for an early date is found in the terminology of the doctrine of the Word which the Odes present. "It is clear," Harris writes, "that they belong to a time when the Wisdom-Christology was passing into the Logos Christology, and had not yet been practically effaced by it" (p. 194). One of the most valuable features of the new edition of the Odes is the careful study of the sapiential terms which the Odist uses; and Harris appeals for explanation of several obscure phrases to the language of Wisd. vii. 25, 26, and of Prov. viii. 22. The words "the Lord is our Mirror" (Ode xiii. 1) recall, as he points out, ἔσοπτρον, which is used of the Divine Wisdom in Wisd. vii. 26. In Ode xii. 5, if the

text be altered, as Gressmann suggests, we come on the word ἀτμίς, which is, in like manner, from the Book of Wisdom. On the words "I was not their brother" (Ode xxviii. 16), which are spoken *ex ore Christi*, Harris appositely points out that this is the very phrase used several times by Cyril of Jerusalem to explain the title μονογενής (as distinct from the Pauline πρωτότοκος). In the middle of Ode xli., all the rest of which is certainly the utterance of a Christian chorus, there are three verses which Harris (contrary to the view that I expressed in my edition) places in the mouth of Christ,—viz.:

> "All those that see Me will be astonished;
> For from another race am I.
> For the Father of Truth remembered Me;
> He who possessed Me from the beginning.
> For His riches begat Me,
> And the thought of His heart."

I had made reference to Prov. viii. 22, "The Lord possessed me in the beginning of His way," but I did not think it could be pressed. Quite a good explanation of the verses is provided, if they are taken as the rejoicing of the newly baptized; *e.g.*, the Syriac homilist Narsai says of the baptized man, "New is his birth, and exceeding strange to them of earth." But Harris may be right in urging a break of personality at verse 8 and again at verse 11; and in bringing verses 8 to 10 into line with the language of Proverbs my general view of the Ode would remain unchanged. One other illustration may be given. In Ode vi. the word "stream" or "torrent" is represented by ἀπόρροια in the Coptic version, and Harris suggests in his Introduction (pp. 154, 195) that this is a reminiscence of Wisd. vii. 25, where Wisdom is said to be "a pure ἀπόρροια from the glory of the Almighty." But, as this argument depends mainly on the assumption that Greek was the original language of the Odes, which Harris does not accept, he offers in his Notes alternative explanations from Ps. xlvi. 4 and Sir. xxiv. 30, 31 of the "stream" of Ode vi. It is not quite clear what his final judgment on this point is, for he appears to waver. He rejects the better explanation (as it seems to me) which he adopted in the *editio princeps* that the source of the ἀπόρροια is to be sought in Ezek. xlvii. I had shown that, this being so, the Ode was apparently baptismal, for the waters of Ezek. xlvii. are interpreted by many Christian writers, including so early a writer as Barnabas, of the waters of baptism. But Harris now rejects, perhaps a little hastily, the Ezekiel parallel. It will be for other scholars to judge what is the true origin of the mysterious "stream." Enough, however, has been said to show that the comparison of the Odes with the Sapiential books is instructive. There are many parallels with these books, as there are in all Christian literature of the first four centuries.

But to claim that, because of these parallels, the Odes must be placed in the first century, or even in the second, seems to me to draw an inference that cannot be sustained. For myself, I see nothing in the doctrine of the Word, as set out in the Odes, which would be surprising in third-century literature, although no one suggests that the Odes are as late as that.

In connection with his researches into the Sapiential doctrine of the Odes, Harris calls attention to phrases which are like those which a Targumist would have used, and to one or two passages in which he thinks the direct influence of the Targums may be traced. Thus he thinks Ode i. to be affected by the Targum on Ps. i., although there is no mention of a " crown " (which is the theme of the Ode) in the Psalm or its Targum. It is probable, I think, that he provides the true explanation for most of his parallels under this head, when he says: " Such expressions [as the Targumistic paraphrases] readily become conventional, at least among Aramaic-speaking peoples. They pass into the religious language of the time " (p. 90). But it is doubtful if we can say more than this. So when in Ode iv. 11 " there is no repentance with Thee: that Thou shouldest repent of anything that Thou hast promised," Harris finds a Targumistic unwillingness to attribute repentance or change of mind to God, one feels inclined to ask if St. Paul then is to be taken as speaking the language of Targum in Rom. xi. 29. There is, undoubtedly, a tendency to cryptic and metaphorical speech in the Odist, but that is not sufficient reason for invoking the Targums as the source of his paraphrases. Harris is on much safer ground when he says of the Odist (p. 403), " we may be sure he is neither a Jew nor a Jewish proselyte," than when he says (p. 91), " the Odist lives next door to the Synagogue and in the Jewish quarter."

We next come to an important question of interpretation. In his first edition, Harris took the line that the Odes had no sacramental reference whatever—a very remarkable fact for Christian hymns of any age, if it were a fact. Just ten years ago I challenged this view,* and pointed out that numerous allusions to baptismal doctrine and ritual might be detected; and I attempted in my edition of 1912 (which was only rendered possible by the courtesy of my friend Dr. Harris in allowing me to use his text) to give a detailed interpretation of the Odes from the standpoint that they were composed as Hymns for the newly-baptized or those who were undergoing instruction as catechumens. It has been generally recognized, I think, in the last few years that there are undoubted references to baptism in the Odes, and the only question now is as to their number and quality. Harris gives up, if I understand him aright, the view that the Odes show no trace of sacramental doctrine, but he thinks that many of

* *Journal of Theological Studies*, October, 1910.

the phrases which I adduced in this connection can be otherwise explained. "Whether the Odes are baptismal *to the extent that has been suggested* appears," he writes, "to us to be doubtful" (p. 223), and he goes on to develop an argument for a baptismal reference in Ode iv. which I had not thought very strong.

The situation, then, is this: It is recognized that there are allusions to baptism in the Odes of Solomon; and it has only to be considered whether these are many or few. In one direction, Dr. Harris goes farther than I should be prepared to follow him. He admits that Cyril of Jerusalem was acquainted with Ode i. (p. 188; *cf.* p. 17), as I had pointed out; and he traces the influence of the Odes at other points (*cf.* pp. 55, 62, etc.). In like manner he claims that Ephraim quotes from the Odes, and uses the Odist's phrases frequently (pp. 18-24); he has adduced several new illustrations from the works of Ephraim which are interesting. But it is not certain that Ephraim (or Cyril, save in the opening phrases of his Procatechesis) is *quoting* from the Odes. It is quite as probable that the similarities of language which have been observed are to be explained by the circumstance that Ephraim is alluding to the familiar phrases and ritual of the baptismal office, from which also the Odist has derived his inspiration. If, however, Dr. Harris' view be accepted, it carries with it the conclusion that, at any rate, Ephraim believed the Odes of Solomon to be baptismal hymns; and that is a strong confirmation of the interpretation which treats them as such. "We have shown abundantly the acquaintance of Ephraim with the Odes, which he quotes and misquotes, understands and obscures" (p. 337); "Ephraim uses our Odes, and deliberately rebaptizes them" (p. 323); "It seems probable that Ephraim has changed Ode xiii. in the interest of the ritual of baptism" (p. 19). But is it not curious that Ephraim the Syrian should have made such a mistake as to the meaning and intention of the Odist as to treat the Odes as baptismal if they were really nothing of the kind? No doubt there is a good deal of uncritical exegesis in the works of the Fathers. It is quite true (see p. 192) that we are not to suppose that Ps. i. is a baptismal poem because Barnabas found mystical allusions to baptism in it. But the case is wholly different here. Ephraim uses language strikingly like that of the Odes in many places, where he is treating of baptism, and where no one will suggest that he is quoting; if he also interprets of baptism phrases which *are* quotations, is it to be said that he is here quite wrong? It seems to me, as I have said, that Dr. Harris has brought forward a new argument from Ephraim in favour of a view of the Odes which yet he is not ready to accept.

Something similar might be said as to the supposed use of the Odes in the Eastern rituals (p. 63). Dr. Harris thinks that Ode xxxviii. was known to the composer of a Nestorian office (p. 149),

who interpreted it in a baptismal sense. He, then, as well as Ephraim and Cyril must have been wrong, if the Ode had no baptismal reference. But it is, again, not necessary to explain similar phrases by the hypothesis of *quotation*. It is more likely that these similarities are due to the fact that the Eastern rituals and the Odist alike made use of phrases expressive of baptismal doctrine and ceremonial. Had Harris used Denzinger's *Ritus Orientalium*, instead of the Romanized Syrian offices which he mentions (p. 132), he would have found many more apposite illustrations.

A difficult problem, to which allusion has already been made, emerges when we try to determine whether the songs of the Odist are to be placed in the mouth of the catechumens or whether they are spoken *ex ore Christi*. Ode xxxvi. provides an instance, as to which a few words may be said. At verse 3 we have: "She [*sc.* the Holy Spirit, feminine as is usual in Syriac literature] brought me forth before the face of the Lord: and, although a son of man, I was named the illuminated one, the Son of God: while I praised among the praising ones, and great among the mighty ones." It would seem pretty clear that the reference is to the new birth of the baptized (φωτισθέντες, *illuminati*), the language being illustrated by Ephraim, as so often: "The Holy Spirit has brooded in baptism, and mystically has given birth" to notable Christians. But Harris, in his last edition, changes his translation, and for "the illuminated one" he substitutes "the Luminary," and interprets the whole passage of Christ. That is, he imports (as he acknowledges, pp. 84, 196, 385) an unusual heresy into the Ode, which would then speak of the Holy Spirit as the Mother of Christ. He changes also the last words of the passage quoted into "I was the most glorified among the glorious ones, and the greatest among the great ones," which he compares with a phrase in the Koran, where Christ is spoken of as "one of those that are near to God." If the change of translation is not really demanded by the Syriac text (and no proof of this is offered) it seems extravagant to introduce it, at the cost of making the Odist heretical in a high degree. I submit that this is a case where the old translation, which places the Ode in the mouth of the *illuminatus*, must stand, and this will carry a baptismal reference throughout.

Here is another case in which Harris has changed his original (and better) rendering in a way which tends to conceal the baptismal meaning. "My heart was circumcised . . . for the Most High circumcised me by His Holy Spirit" (Ode xi. 1, 2). These are the actual words which Cyril of Jerusalem uses of baptism: ἁγίῳ πνεύματι διὰ τοῦ λουτροῦ περιτεμνόμενοι. Harris has now substituted "clave" for "circumcised," although he is careful to point out that the word is the usual Syriac for circumcision. "It would lower

the Ode to try to reproduce such a nuance in English" (p. 268). Yes, but for the interpretation of the Ode we must go back to what the Odist actually wrote.

I am conscious that I am laying stress on points where I differ from Dr. Harris, rather than on the many points where I agree with him. But, as he says himself, "every stone must be turned, and turned again," before scholarship can give its final decision on these beautiful poems. And so it is more helpful to discuss phrases, which must be difficult because of the variety of their interpretation, than to dwell on matters already decided. Here, then, is a passage in Ode xxv.: "I was clothed with the covering of thy Spirit, and thou didst remove from me my raiment of skin." What is the "raiment of skin"? The answer is found in the mystical interpretation given by Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, Ephraim and others, of the "coats of skins" of Gen. iii. 21. They represent the *νέκρωσις* or liability to death which human nature incurred at the Fall; and this corruptible nature was supposed to be laid aside at baptism. Thus Jerome says of the baptized: ". . . *tunicas pelliceas deposuerimus, tunc induemur veste linea.*" Ode xxv. is plainly baptismal, and the words "thou didst set a lamp at my right hand and at my left" refer to the practice of placing tapers in the hands of the newly baptized. There are other baptismal phrases in the Ode. Now Dr. Harris will not allow this at all. He finds an explanation of the "raiment of skin" in the doctrine which Bardaisan and his followers seem to have held about the human body, which they regarded as vile (pp. 26, 350), and in certain Manichean tenets which contrasted body and soul as darkness and light. But he does not quote anything to show that Bardaisan or the Manicheans made use of the phrase "coats of skins" from Gen. iii. 21. This is really the point, and Harris does not touch it. It is to go beyond the evidence to urge that the language of Bardaisan, as quoted by Ephraim, has any reference to the "coats of skins," or to Ode xxv. And to suggest that the language of Prov. vi. 23, "The commandment is a lamp, and the law a light," provides a sufficient explanation of the lamps in the right and left hands of the Odist is not adequate exegesis. We cannot get rid in so facile a manner of the baptismal allusions in the "coats of skin" and the "lamps" of Ode xxv., nor can we conclude that the Ode was known to Bardaisan.

Again, what are we to say about the "crown" which is so frequently mentioned in the Odes? Cyril of Jerusalem, by using the words of Ode i. (as Harris admits), interpreted the crown as the baptismal garland; and Ephraim did the same thing. Harris, however, suggests (although he does not explicitly say) that it is a *nuptial* crown which is in the Odist's mind, and that Ode i. is an epithalamium (p. 212), or was regarded as such in the early days of the Syrian

Church. But what then about Cyril? And what about Odes v., ix., xvii., xx., all of which are "garland-Odes" and which may be "assigned to the same category" (p. 213)? The fact is that no other *single* explanation, except that the "crown" is the baptismal garland, will apply to all these garland-Odes; and it is recognized that the *same* explanation should be given in each case.

Or, once more, I pointed out that the exhortation "Keep my secret" in Ode viii. is identical with Cyril's warning to catechumens, *τήρησον τὸ μυστήριον*. Harris accepts the parallelism, but is unwilling to allow any allusion to baptism. He quotes the saying *μυστήριον ἐμὸν ἐμοὶ καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς μου*, which goes back to a Hexaplar reading of Isa. xxiv. 16, and says that "such a saying cannot have had a baptismal reference in the first instance." Of course it had not, but that does not affect the parallelism between Cyril and the Odist, which is too close to suppose that they were drawing independently upon Isaiah. To say that "an acquaintance with mystical language and esoteric teaching makes it clear that the injunction in the Odes has nothing to do with baptismal ritual," is not very convincing. Such acquaintance as I have with the mystical language of the Fathers suggests to me that the baptismal reference of the Odist is very clear. This is a good instance of the different appeal which the same facts make to different minds.

The truth is that the problem of the Odes is just this, as Harris rightly perceives: Either they are later in date than he puts them, or the baptismal allusions must be explained away and some other consistent interpretation of the Odes advanced. I hold that the attempt to place them "on the borders of the first century" has failed, and that there is no evidence at all that they were written before A.D. 150 to 170. If that be their date, there is no reason why they should not reveal a well-developed doctrine and ceremonial of baptism. Dr. Harris asks a very pertinent question when discussing the curious passage in Ode xix. about the Birth of Christ from a Virgin —viz.:

> "She travailed and brought forth a Son without incurring pain;
> For it did not happen without purpose;
> And she had not required a midwife,
> For He [God] delivered her."

Here is the "doctrine of the Virgin Birth in a highly evolved form. . . . Can we really refer this kind of speculation to the borders of the first century?" The answer, I believe, must be in the negative. The idea that God was, as it were, the midwife, is a patristic inference from Ps. xxii. 9, as I pointed out in my edition. Harris takes up the point, and lays great stress on it, but there is no earlier evidence for this extravagance of exegesis than Tertullian.* I am inclined now

* Origen (*in loc.*) has the comment: *θεὸν γὰρ γενόμενον ὁ πατὴρ ἐμαιεύσατο*, a much earlier development of the idea than that by Eusebius, of which Harris makes too much.

to think that the ultimate source of the idea that the Virgin Birth was painless may be Isa. lxvi. 7: " Before she travailed, she brought forth; before her pain came she was delivered of a man child." This, which the prophet spoke of Zion, is applied to the Virgin Birth by Irenæus in the newly-discovered *Demonstration* (§ 54), who draws the inference " thus he shows that His birth from the Virgin was unforeseen and unexpected." Methodius quotes the same passage to show, as he says, that the Lord's Birth was ἀμόλυντος, or unpolluted.*

However, I pass on to another criticism, but it shall be the last. Dr. Harris says on Ode xxiv. that " there seems to be some occult connection of ideas between the baptism of Christ and the Descent into Hades," but he does not discuss the point at all. Now it is certainly a point of importance. I have shown, as I believe, that the connection between the folklore, as it may be called, of the Descent into Hades, and the folklore of baptism is close and intimate,† and that the true interpretation of the famous passage 1 Pet. iii. 19-22 is that baptism is antitypal to the Lord's *Descensus*. If this be not recognized, the recurrence of the topic of the Descent into Hades in our Odes is unintelligible; and, in fact, the treatment of several Odes, notably Odes xxii. and xxxi., is quite inadequate because of the omission to comment on it. This is the true key to the interpretation of the Odes of Solomon, as I believe; at any rate, it is the only key which has been brought forward to the obscurities of the passages which speak of the " dissolving of the abysses " and the like.

It ought to be added, in conclusion, that Dr. Harris has made many valuable suggestions in his new edition, by way of quotations from the Canonical Psalms. Whether the Odist built as much on the Psalms or consciously borrowed as much as Harris suggests may be questioned; but that he was familiar with the Psalms, and that they affected his style and his phraseology, has been abundantly illustrated in this fine edition. It is not the least of Dr. Harris's many services to patristic learning that he discovered and gave to the world this remarkable collection of Christian poetry; and he has the satisfaction of knowing that, whether his friends agree with all his interpretations or no, they are only able to criticize him by using the text and the materials which he has placed within their reach.

J. H. Bernard.

* *De Simeone et Anna*, § III. He quotes Isa. lxvi. 7 again in his *Banquet* (viii. 4) as predictive of the travail of the Church, in giving birth to those who are baptized.

† In my edition of the *Odes of Solomon* (1912), and more fully in *Studia Sacra*, chap. i. (1917).

KING'S COLLEGE LECTURES ON IMMORTALITY. Edited by W. R. Matthews, M.A., B.D., Dean of King's College, London. London: Hodder and Stoughton, Ltd. 1920. 6s. net.

To deal effectively with a subject like Immortality in a single lecture is not easy; such a lecture can only contain suggestions, must take many things for granted, and will always leave loose ends to be tied up by the sympathetic hearer as best he may. To print half-a-dozen lectures of this kind, by different authors, in a single volume, is to offer a bewildering number of conflicting suggestions, all presented as " the results of academic study " (p. v), to take for granted half-a-dozen mutually exclusive backgrounds of thought, and so to multiply the loose ends that the reader, however sympathetic, may well recoil from the task of ravelling them all up into one skein.

The subject is one which bristles with philosophical questions; and the only authors here who, to my mind, treat these questions satisfactorily are the two who make no claim to a philosophical or scientific approach: Professor Bethune-Baker and Dr. Relton. The former (*The Religious Value of the Idea of a Future Life*) finds himself, as often happens in courses like this, hampered by an uncongenial and ill-chosen title; but when he gets to work he shows all his accustomed fine and delicate sense of the real problems. In the matter of immortality, as in many others, he feels how the Christian view of life is straitened in the tabernacle of its ancient formulæ, which often lend themselves to a " static or quantitative " interpretation, antithetical to the true spirit of Christianity, but claiming protection as essential to the Christian tradition.

Professor Caldecott (*The Argument from the Emotions*) seems to have two distinct arguments. The first runs as follows: There is a desire for a future life (this he assumes without discussion or explanation), and if objects do not exist corresponding to our desires —whatever that means—" the situation is irrational in the extreme." There is no attempt to defend or explain this astonishing assertion.

The other argument appears to run thus: Whatever belief tends to promote hope, admiration, love, joy, rather than their opposites, is true. The belief in a future life does tend to promote these, therefore it is true. It is a pity the devils of James ii. 19 had never heard of this argument; its application might have relieved what for them was a very uncomfortable situation.

Dean Rashdall deals with *The Moral Argument for Personal Immortality*. This world of ours, he asserts, is so full of pain and evil that the good there is in it is quite outweighed, and a moral being who could annihilate it would certainly do so. Therefore, unless we can regard it as a prelude to another, happier, world, we cannot believe in a loving or moral God. I do not think one need challenge the Dean's gloomy view of this world in order to refute this argument.

It is enough to criticize the idea that goods and evils can be added up and weighed off against one another. For if that idea is rejected —as it surely must be—the idea of asking whether a given world is on the whole " worth while " becomes meaningless.

Apart from this argument the essay contains little but girdings at the stupidity and blindness and perversity and un-Christianity of " philosophers "—a class which, after all, has the honour of counting the Dean himself among not the least distinguished of its members. Professor Brown (*Immortality in the Light of Modern Psychology*) says frankly that modern psychology throws little, if any, light on the subject at all. But at the end of his lecture he makes some sound and much-needed observations on the unreliability of " spiritualistic " evidence. " You need," he says, " to have stored in your mind a lot of facts of pathological psychology," before you can judge the value of such data. We would willingly have exchanged all the discussion of well-worn psychophysical theories, and all the analysis of Bergson for a whole lecture on this theme.

Finally, Dr. Relton (*The Christian Contribution to the Conception of Eternal Life*) analyses admirably the main features of the Christian doctrine. The life of God, and therefore our eternal life, is not a life of " sublime self-satisfaction," but one of pain and sacrifice, the life of " a victorious spirit wrestling with sin and death." This conception annihilates the arguments both of Professor Caldecott and of the Dean of Carlisle; and I should maintain that it is philosophically as sound as theirs are indefensible. He also effectively routs both " pantheism " (impersonal immortality) and the immortality of the soul, with its attendant dualism of soul and body—a Greek idea, definitely rejected by Christian thought. Here, by the way, he cuts the ground bodily from under Professor Brown's psychophysics.

The whole lecture up to this point is equally good as philosophy and as Christian doctrine; but in the last section Dr. Relton unhappily decides to sketch his ideal of a Christian Philosophy—an excellent idea in itself—and to indicate its main theses, illustrating them by reference to various modern philosophers of repute. The result is not a success. Dr. Relton, we venture to say, does not always see the exact bearing of the doctrines he criticizes, and those he propounds are something very different from the deep and subtle Christian philosophy which underlies the earlier part of his essay.

R. G. Collingwood.

LAMBETH CONFERENCE REVIEWS

III.—PROBLEMS OF MARRIAGE AND SEXUAL MORALITY

Lambeth Conference, 1920. Resolutions 66, 67, 68, 69, 70.

People of the English-speaking Church, and many others not belonging to her communion, have received welcome assistance from the Report of the Lambeth Conference, 1920.

Among the many problems agitating the nation at the present time there are none more important, none more eagerly debated, than those which concern marriage and sexual morality. It is a hopeful symptom in the body politic that these problems are being widely discussed and that a general expectation existed of a definite lead on the part of the Conference. The worst enemy of all is indifference; the most deadly symptom of disease is failure of vitality; and amongst much that is painful and even dangerous in our present spiritual and moral condition, the general and deep interest taken in the problems of marriage and of sexual morality is both a possible means of reviving vitality, and also a sign that we are surely not dead but sleeping.

In Resolution 66 the Conference recognizes the possibility and the obligation of universal chastity and purity. It holds up this standard as binding on men, as well as on women.

The dual standard of morality accepted by public opinion and recognized by law is not the standard of nature nor of God. Naturally men are capable of continence and self-control, but these duties have been made more difficult for them by long-continued self-indulgence, condoned and even approved by public opinion. The fear of bastardy and the visible inconveniences of immorality in the case of the woman have had the effect of an outside conscience defending her virtue and strengthening her powers of self-control; whereas in the case of the man lapses from virtue and absence of purity formed no bar to honourable matrimony, and parents were only too ready to give their daughter in marriage to a man who was known to be immoral if his other circumstances were desirable. The natural result has been over-cultivation of the man's sexual nature, and a greatly increased difficulty in dealing with it.

Doctors must bear their share of blame in this matter, for they have frequently assented to the proposition that sexual intercourse is essential to the wellbeing of a man, though they never ventured to say that it was requisite for a woman. At the present time there are very few doctors who advise in this sense, and the evidence given by them before the Royal Commission on the Venereal Diseases and before the Birth-Rate Commissions was practically unanimous, to the effect that continence is practicable for all men; that no injury

to health or to virility is caused by continence; and that incontinence before marriage, and unchastity after marriage, are likely to be followed by infection with the venereal diseases.

In Resolution 67 " the Conference affirms as our Lord's principle and standard of marriage a lifelong and indissoluble union, for better for worse, of one man with one woman, to the exclusion of all others on either side, and calls on all Christian people to maintain and bear witness to this standard."

This is a short, clear, and fearless statement of the Christian law of marriage—*a union between one man and one woman, lifelong and indissoluble*. There is no question here of divorce being justified to suit the convenience of people who have married without due consideration, and without sufficient investigation into the character and the health, bodily and mental, of the proposed partner. In the Committee's Report on which the Resolution is founded, stress is laid on the importance of a right preparation for marriage, for an increased dignity of courtship and betrothal, and on the instruction that should be given to young people on the care of their bodies, the wise regulation of their functions, and on the share that parents, teachers, and clergy should take in the moral instruction of the young. They are more especially urged to help by placing courtship, betrothal, and marriage on a higher plane of dignity. Probably the revival of the old ceremony of betrothal and the observance of some time of probation between betrothal and marriage would be helpful, by affording opportunity for better mutual knowledge, and of investigation by parents as to the general suitability of health, morals, and circumstances.

The second clause of Resolution 67 admits the right of churches within the Anglican Communion to deal with cases of divorce in consequence of adultery on the part of one of the partners to the union. This admission is probably inevitable; for it may be contended that the erring partner has already broken the union, and that the case is covered by our Lord's words, as recorded by St. Matthew (v. 32, and xix. 9). All the same it is to be regretted, the remarriage of the innocent party automatically shutting out the guilty from full repentance—repentance consisting of contrition, confession, absolution, and reparation—which last element is rendered impossible by the remarriage of the innocent party.

This, then—the cause of adultery—is the single ground of divorce contemplated by the Conference. Other alleged causes, such as insanity, prolonged imprisonment, and desertion, are not even referred to. The Committee (p. 111) submitted that " no compassion for present hardships in particular cases can justify the lowering for all of the standard of Christ, which alone insures the welfare of society and of the race."

People who advocate divorce for insanity, crime, desertion, and other lesser reasons, do not, apparently, consider the injury inflicted by divorce on the partners to the union, their children, and the State. They believe that freedom from the heavy burden of an uncongenial or impossible partner is clear gain, and they do not take into consideration the hardship on the other partner who may recover from illness, who will, in time, be set free from prison, and who may repent of desertion, or whose supposed desertion may have been involuntary detention. Enough weight is not given by the public to the position of the partner divorced against his or her will; still less is the injury to the children adequately considered. Each child has a right to the care and love of both its parents, and imperfect as they may be they are capable of amendment, and few, indeed, are they who have not some value to their children. The remarriage of the divorced couple tends to bring confusion and divided interests into a family—such a family may consist of at least three sets of children: those of the man by his former wife, those of the woman by her former husband, and the children of the second marriage. Greater complications are not uncommon where people may be divorced two or three times, as in Sweden and some of the States of America.

Access to divorce is already too easy, and although neither sex nor expense should come into the question, increased facilities can only lead to increased laxity of morals, to depreciation of the honour in which marriage should be held, and to the undermining of the foundations of the State.

In the third clause of Section 67 the Conference acknowledged the difficulty of the State in framing laws which must bind all its subjects, Christian and non-Christian. This difficulty was also felt by the Committee, which suggested that if no better plan could be devised a possible solution is universal civil marriage, followed by the solemnization of the contract by the Church in the case of those couples who desire it. This arrangement would relieve the clergy from going through the solemn farce of reading the marriage service on behalf of people who look on it only as a social function, who do not sincerely seek the Divine blessing, and who have no intention of ordering their lives in accordance with its admonitions. This solution may be the only one practicable, but it presents much difficulty in its working. At home it would open up invidious questions. So great is the force of custom that many non-Christian couples wish to be married in church, to have their children baptized in church, and to be buried in the churchyard. This is the outcome of custom and fetichism at home and would probably give rise to much trouble. In some parts of the foreign field civil marriage divorced from religious ceremony would be a cause of grave scandal, not only to native Christians, but to our heathen fellow-citizens, who are all

imbued with strong, albeit imperfect and erroneous religious beliefs, and who are shocked to find professing Christians unmindful of the laws of their religion.

Section 68 of the Resolution of the Conference deals with the difficult subject of voluntary restriction of the birth-rate.

The Bishops did not lay down rules to meet every abnormal case, but they uttered "an emphatic warning against the use of unnatural means for the avoidance of conception," and they emphasized the grave dangers—physical, moral, and religious—thereby incurred, and . . . the evils with which the extension of such use threatens the race." On this subject the Committee said it was aware "that many persons of undoubted sincerity, whose opinions are entitled to respect . . . consider the whole matter as chiefly a question of expediency to be determined on medical, financial, and social grounds. This contention we cannot admit, as we believe that the question cannot be separated from the moral and religious issues involved."

The Committee might have gone further and considered that so far as medical grounds are concerned, there is much division of medical opinion, and that many doctors of great and long experience believe that worse harm is done to the wife by the use of contraceptives than by the acceptance of a natural family. From the nature of the case no statistics can be offered on either side, but there is a considerable mass of observation and experience which goes far to justify the belief that nervous breakdowns are more common among women who are deliberately thwarting the functions of their nature.

The practice of the voluntary limitation of conception began with the better educated classes, and has extended to the wage-earners. So widespread is the practice, and so dependent is it on the economic position of the family, that the number of children in a family appears to be governed chiefly by the amount earned, and by the desire of the parents to secure easier circumstances for themselves and their offspring. Thus the restriction affects chiefly those who are best able to maintain a family.

The influence of Church teaching and Church discipline is shown in the amount of limitation practised by the members of different Churches. The Jews maintain their old fertility approved and enforced by their religion, and the Roman Catholics whose priests teach them that voluntary restriction is wrong have a birth-rate of 6·6 per 1,000 against a general birth-rate of 3·3 per 1,000 for England and Wales.

The question of the birth-rate and of its limitation is a difficult one —some women are very fertile and apt to have children at too short intervals. This is bad for their health, and bad for the family as a whole. The woman who has three children under four years of age is likely to be very overburdened, and to be unable to give the time

and energy that are essential to the children's best development. The man who has a large family is compelled to work harder and longer than the man who has one or two children only. He also finds it more difficult to obtain house-room and sometimes employment.

On the other hand, there can be no doubt that if men and women were not so badly *over sexed*, as they have been trained to be, the "natural family" would be one that could be well maintained, and that would not make undue demands on the parents.

Prudence in marital relations, abstaining by mutual consent for a time, and the fulfilment by the mother of the natural function of lactation, would probably result in a moderate family, which would confer happiness and moral worth on its parents.

From the national or imperial point of view, while Canada and Australia have an average of about one citizen to each square mile, we need not fear over-population, and the State should be able to adjust taxation so as to help the man who presents it with a reasonable number of children. In this connection must be mentioned the proposals for the Endowment of Motherhood, whereby a woman would receive 5s. a week for her first child, and 3s. 6d. weekly for each succeeding child until the youngest reached the age of five years.

In Section 69 of its Resolutions the Conference glances at the enormous subject of the prevalence, incidence, and causes of the venereal diseases, and at the measures proposed for their prevention and cure. These diseases are the cause of a heavy percentage of ante-natal mortality, and are responsible for a large share of the mortality of infants under the age of one year. They cause more than half the blindness, a third of the deafness of the young, one-sixth of all the insanity in the country, and about half of the sterility and half of the idiocy and feeble-mindedness. Anything that can be done to prevent and to cure these diseases is a national duty. The Conference therefore "supports all efforts which are consistent with high moral standards to check the causes of the diseases. . . . We impress upon the clergy and members of the Church the duty of joining with physicians and public authorities in meeting this scourge," but "the Conference must condemn the distribution or use, before exposure to infection, of so-called prophylactics, since these cannot but be regarded as an invitation to vice." This last sentence was a direct quotation by the Bishops who drew up and passed the Resolution from the report of the Committee of Bishops who were appointed to consider moral problems.

In Section 70 immediately following on this pronouncement, the Conference wisely urges various measures whereby the moral tone of the nation, and especially of the young people of the nation, may be raised to a higher plane. The Bishops urge all men and women of goodwill to co-operate with, and to stimulate, public authorities in the suppression of "such incentives to vice as indecent literature,

suggestive plays and films, the open or secret sale of contraceptives, and the continued existence of brothels." Further, in Section 71, the Conference emphasizes the duty of parents to deal honestly with their children by imparting to them a dignified and pure knowledge of the facts of life and of sexual hygiene, so as to guard them from acquiring distorted, vulgarized, and shameful information from those who seek to corrupt their youth.

In this connection the Committee urged "the wise and firm administration of laws relating to street solicitation, both by men and women; the safeguarding of decency in parks and other places of public recreation; the employment of women police; and the raising of the age of consent to eighteen." Probably had the Committee and Conference known that women magistrates were to be appointed, they would have welcomed them as being likely to be of service in the many cases of sexual offences brought into the Magistrates' Courts.

Lastly, in Section 72 of the Resolutions, the Conference "deplores the common apathy of Church-people in regard to Preventive and Rescue Work, and urges on Bishops, Clergy, and all Christian people the duty of taking a more active share in this essential part of the Church's life." The report of the Committee on this point is particularly full and helpful. One cannot but recognize in it the influence of the chairman, the Bishop of London. He is an enthusiast in this most necessary and sacred mission for the comfort of the sorrowful and the restoration of those who are lost. A sentence or two may be quoted—"In the case of those who have sinned methods of repression are largely discredited. It is recognized that the beauty and happiness of a Christian life should be put before them, . . . along with the discipline which is needed for building the character . . . more thought should be given to the building up of pure manhood and womanhood, whereby both God will be glorified and the Commonwealth be served."

Practically enough, and characteristically, the Committee's report closes with a suggestion "that some form of Public Morality Council, by whatever name it may be called, may be established in every large city, with local branches to deal with the ever-varying local forms of evil."

The whole section of Resolutions and the whole of the Committee's Report should be carefully and prayerfully studied by all "who are set in authority," by all our "Pastors and Masters," by all men and women of goodwill; by all who are prepared to live and to die "for God and the Empire," by all who feel with Blake—

> "I will not cease from mental fight,
> Nor shall my sword sleep in my hand,
> Till we have built Jerusalem
> In England's green and pleasant land."

MARY SCHARLIEB.

IV.—CHRISTIANITY AND THEOSOPHY

It is not without grave reason that the Bishops at Lambeth have devoted a part of their time to the consideration of Theosophy. However laudable may be the three avowed objects of the Theosophical Society as officially set forth, when large numbers of baptized persons are being led on through their membership in this Society to a definite repudiation of the Christian faith, and a definite self-alienation from the privileges of the Church, it was clear that the time had come for an authoritative statement by the leaders of the Church of the real significance of Theosophy in the light of the faith. The highly compressed sentences of Resolutions 64 and 65 of the Lambeth Conference are pregnant with meaning, and will repay the very careful attention of all who may come into touch either directly or indirectly with even the outer circle of Theosophic propaganda.

"The Conference warns Christian people . . . to be on their guard against the ultimate bearing of theosophical teaching." What this is, is briefly indicated in the Report of the Committee. Theosophy, according to one of the publications of the Society quoted in the Report, is "the body of truths which forms the basis of all religions, and which cannot be claimed as the exclusive possession of any." Theosophists further maintain that this basic body of truths is known to the "divine Teachers, superhuman men, often called the White Brotherhood," who have revealed some part of it from time to time as men were found ready to receive it. A considerable revelation was made by means of the ancient Greek mysteries, and Pythagoras is now one of the Great White Brotherhood himself, and is known to Theosophists as the Master K.H. For many centuries revelations were intermittent, and adepts few and far between, though the tradition was never wholly lost among mortal men. In modern times the Theosophical Society was founded to be a means of fresh communication of the hidden truths, and Mme. Blavatsky, Colonel Olcott, Mrs. Besant, and a few others have attained to a high enough stage of development to come into direct touch with the Masters, and also to become able themselves to read the etheric records of the past. Their statements, therefore, in the sphere of religion or any other, are those of persons possessed of absolute knowledge, and any conflicting statement or opinion is *ipso facto* convicted of error. The exoteric religions are explained as based on partial revelations of fragments of the basic truth, more or less misunderstood and misrepresented by their exponents, and it is in Theosophy alone that the true esoteric meaning of the various religions is to be found. Some of these religions have been more faithful exponents than others of the inner truth, and the Theosophic leaders have variously adopted those that most appealed to them; Mme. Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott became

professed Buddhists, and Mrs. Besant, as far as circumstances permit, has embraced Hinduism. Christianity is represented as having suffered more than either of these two religions from the ignorance of its early exponents, and if we would understand its inner meaning, we must accept the explanations and emendations of Theosophy—as, for instance, such statements as that Jesus lived 100 B.C.; that He is not to be identified with the World Teacher, called the Christ; that He accepted and taught the doctrine of reincarnation, and so on. It is true that these statements conflict with "exoteric Christianity," but to the Theosophist that is only an indication that goes to confirm the contention that exoteric Christianity is not the product of those who know, and the New Testament is either submitted to an "arbitrary and artificial exegesis," to quote the Report, or dealt with in the time-honoured fashion of Gnostic controversialists, and such part as is inconvenient summarily rejected. Such is some part at least of the position that is involved in "the ultimate bearing of theosophical teaching," against which "the Conference warns Christian people . . . to be on their guard."

The Committee does not omit to notice the evasive attitude always assumed by the Theosophist in controversy. "The Society," says the Report, "disclaims any authoritative or obligatory body of teaching or any official identification with the views propounded by its leaders"; but the Committee "cannot but regard the Theosophical Society as incurring a certain measure of responsibility by the publication and circulation of theosophical literature." This is such measure of plain and common-sense literary justice as might be meted out to any society, and the Theosophical Society in particular is in no position to disclaim its own teaching. Every member of the Esoteric Section knows well that for those who would make real progress in Theosophy there is a great deal that is of faith, and the familiar statement that Theosophy has no dogmas only applies to the outer circle of membership. The Esoteric Section is the nucleus of the whole movement, its members are pledged to uttermost obedience to the Head of the School, and for them, at least, the statements of certain leaders constitute an absolute and indisputable authority. It would be well if this position were more widely realized, that intending members might understand in time to what they are committing themselves. It is no doubt with the nature of these obligations in mind that "the Conference warns Christian people . . . to examine strictly the character and credentials of the teachers upon whose authority they are encouraged or compelled to rely."

The warning is the more needed in view of "the seemingly Christian elements contained in" the teaching. Many persons at the present time are entering upon the study of Theosophy under the impression that so far from renouncing Christianity thereby, they

are at last learning to understand the real meaning of our Lord's teaching. A change in attitude towards Christianity has taken place of recent years in Theosophic literature; the open hostility of early days has passed away, and some recent publications are so plausibly Christian in language that it is not surprising that the inexperienced should be deceived as to what lies behind. An unwary and uninstructed Christian, with little knowledge of doctrine and no very clear understanding of the meaning of terms, may easily be led on to a position wholly at variance with Christianity, while remaining convinced that he is a better Christian than those who try to open his eyes. Whether this studied use of Christian language indicates a genuine approximation towards the Christian position, or whether it is a deliberate decoy, or whether, again, the writers are so profoundly ignorant of the real significance of Christianity as honestly to believe that the two systems are not incompatible, it is not easy to say. There is no doubt that a systematic attempt has been made for several years to capture Christianity on a large scale. The preaching of "the Coming Christ," which deceived some who should have known better, until it turned out that the part of the Christ was to be played by Krishnamurti, was a move in this direction, and quite recently a pamphlet has appeared exposing the fact that certain Theosophic leaders in India have received ordination at the hands of an Old Catholic Bishop. There are, we are convinced, many persons who have involved themselves in the toils of Theosophy who are admittedly hungering for the Sacraments, but, Theosophy remaining what it is, such means of providing them appears to us to be in the highest degree sacrilegious.

The wording of both Resolutions and Report is so guardedly moderate as almost to give the impression of understating the situation. They contain, however, some uncompromising expressions, and every word of warning should be given its due weight. In the words of the Resolution: "The Conference . . . desires to express its conviction that there are cardinal elements in the positive teaching current in theosophical circles and literature which are irreconcilable with the Christian faith." The Report of the Committee enumerates the chief of these irreconcilable elements. The theosophical conception of God appears in the West to be "a nebulous theism," but in India "assumes somewhat of a pantheistic or even polytheistic form." The doctrine of reincarnation "leaves apparently no place for conscious continuity of personality or personal relationships." Without these there is no possibility of fellowship, and the Church of Christ, as emphasized in the Bishops' Encyclical Letter, is essentially a fellowship. Further the doctrine of *karma* "evacuates forgiveness of all spiritual reality." But "the conflict between Theosophy and the Christian faith becomes irreconcilable

when we reach the central fact of Christianity, the Person of Christ." The "triple Christ of theosophical research (*i.e.*, historical, mythical, and mystical) . . . is not the Christ of the New Testament. It is a flagrant contradiction of the Gospels." It may be worth while to explain further that the Historical Christ is represented by Theosophy as the successor of the Buddha in the office of "World Teacher," and is further expressly identified with Krishna of the Indian pantheon, a god whose modern worship is one of the most impure cults in India; while "Jesus" is stated to have been a human disciple, whose body was lent for three years for the use of the Great Teacher, the Christ, and who in a subsequent incarnation, as Apollonius of Tyana, became a "Master," a member of the Great White Brotherhood, and at the present time, "clothed in a body he has taken from Syria, is waiting the time for his appearance in the open life of men," and meanwhile "lives mostly in the mountains of Lebanon." More should not be needed to make abundantly clear the irreconcilable nature of the conflict between Theosophy and the Christian faith.

The second of the Resolutions is entirely constructive. The Conference recognizes "that modern movements of thought connected with . . . Theosophy join with the Christian Church in protesting against a materialistic view of the universe" (Res. 55), and believes "that the attraction of Theosophy for some Christian people lies largely in its presentation of Christian faith as a quest for knowledge" (Res. 64). Protest against materialism and an earnest quest for knowledge ought not to lead men out of the Church, and it is in large measure a reproach to the Church that they are doing so. The Conference suggests the true remedy. Thinkers on the lines of Clement and Origen have had too little influence on Christian theology, and the Church should beware of forgetting "the needs of such souls as are deeply conscious of the mystery" of truth, to quote the words of the Committee. It is therefore recommended "that in the current teaching of the Church due regard should be given to the mystical elements of faith and life which underlie the historic belief of Christendom." There is no little tragedy in the fact that souls are wandering away from Christ and the Church through hunger for precisely that spiritual satisfaction that can alone be found in Christ and His Church. It was recently remarked, in view of the modern widespread revolt against dogma, "We do not give people nearly enough credit for ignorance." Instruction, definite and systematic, is what Christian people are grievously needing, and were it more widely given, many thoughtful souls would assuredly be saved from the byways of heresy.

E. R. McNeile.

NOTICES

THE CONTEMPORARY DRAMA OF ENGLAND. By Thomas H. Dickinson. John Murray. 1920. 7s. 6d.

This is a book dealing with the growth of English drama from 1843 up to the present time, and as it aims at giving a critical estimate of all the most considerable plays that have appeared during that period in the compass of 240 pages, it is obvious that the criticism cannot be very detailed or profound. The result is that we have before us not so much a critical study as a handbook to English drama, a catalogue of the different authors who have written plays, and a list of their works, together with critical observations on the more important of those works which are at any rate always carefully thought out even if not very original or illuminating. The book begins with an account of the progress by which the monopoly of the so-called " patent houses " was broken down; previous to 1843 only three theatres in England were legally allowed to produce national drama—namely, Drury Lane, Covent Garden, and the Little Theatre in the Haymarket. In that year an Act for the freeing of the theatres was passed by Parliament, with the result that the companies of the great houses were suddenly scattered through the different minor theatres, which had always struggled with various degrees of success against the monopoly of the patent houses. The great days of theatrical prosperity did not, however, begin till after 1866, for whereas between 1843 and 1866 there were only twenty-five theatres in London, that number had doubled by the end of the century—a period that saw the rise of the Bancrofts, the Kendals, Henry Irving, Ellen Terry, Charles Wyndham, and Beerbohm Tree, to mention only the most famous of nineteenth-century actors and actor-managers. Among the poetic dramatists of the Victorian age, Mr. Dickinson gives the palm to Browning, and goes so far as to say that " Strafford " stands above every other nineteenth-century tragedy except the " Cenci." This is surely to overstate the case. "Strafford" is a fine play, full of very stately blank verse, but it is confused in action and blurred in outline, and the end, though described by Mr. Dickinson as " moon-glow," is hopelessly undramatic. To compare it with another historical play of the same period—though it was actually produced a good deal later—" Becket " has equal merit as a literary drama, and as a matter of fact had much greater success on the stage.

Following on the account of the romantic drama as represented by Tennyson and Browning, we have a good chapter on the French " well-made " play and its influence on the English theatre. Mr. Dickinson says well that it could never be mistaken for either art or life; it was a machine-made product, of technical perfection, but essentially lacking in inspiration. When we get to the English drama of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Mr. Dickinson's best chapters are those on Robertson, Sydney Grundy, Jones, and Pinero, especially perhaps on Jones and Pinero. He says that Jones's plays present us with the best picture of the middle-

class mind that we have in the theatre in its conventional code of morals and its lack of any absolute standards of conduct. It is, indeed, a code of morals in many ways reminding us of Clough's famous version of the Decalogue:

> "No graven images may be
> Worshipped, except the currency."
>
> "At church on Sundays to attend
> Will serve to keep the world thy friend."

And

> "Do not adultery commit:
> Advantage rarely comes of it";

the last of which may indeed be said almost to sum up the ethical teaching of such a play as "The Liars" on the graver moral problems of life.

There is a long chapter on Bernard Shaw, containing some acute criticisms of that writer. Mr. Dickinson says of him with perfect truth that he is not primarily a dramatist at all, but uses the stage as a pulpit from which to preach. His characters, as Mr. Dickinson humorously says, seem "but lately to have discovered the faculty of speech," and can mostly be best described as "left talking," like Tamur at the end of "Man and Superman." We must, however, join issue with our author when he talks of the "pure magic" of some of Shaw's scenes. The word "magic" has a poetic connotation, a sense of escape into the infinite and eternal, which expresses what Bernard Shaw never gives us; he is a satirist, a preacher, a journalist, but never for one moment a poet. The same absence of any true understanding and appreciation of poetry probably accounts for Mr. Dickinson's inadequate treatment of such authors as Yeats and Synge, neither of whom is more than just mentioned, though it is fair to say that all Synge's plays but one are placed by Mr. Dickinson in his list of works that live in the memory. As he says himself, "it is the work that has some magic in it that is remembered," and, tried by this standard, the "Playboy of the Western World" and "Riders to the Sea" will be read long after lost contemporary plays are forgotten. In the same connection some mention should have been made of Lord Dunsany's "Plays of Gods and Men," one of which, the "Tents of the Arabs," is among the most beautiful works of pure imagination that has appeared in recent days.

Mr. Dickinson gives us a good account of the work of Granville Barker, Galsworthy, Barrie, Masefield and other writers of to-day, and with reference to Galsworthy makes an interesting point in saying that social justice is no longer an issue for art; it is now too much accepted and taken for granted in current thought. His criticism of present-day drama is on the whole justified when he says that either it is taken up with sex-problems, eugenics, and social reform, or else seeks relaxation from these in musical comedy and brainless farces.

His final conclusion on the English theatre is that its special genius is for intellectual comedy, as compared with the French *genre sérieux* on the one hand, and the vaudeville on the other, and from this point of view he gives us a very fairly adequate survey of its history and development. We must, however, be allowed to protest against Americanizations of spelling such as "center" and "molder," and against expressions such as "tangential twists," "overseen embraces," "theatric," and "acerbant."

HENRY THE SIXTH: A reprint of John Blacman's Memoir, with Translation and Notes. By M. R. James, Litt.D., F.B.A., F.S.A., Provost of Eton. Cambridge University Press. 1919. Pp. xvi + 60. 5s. net.

A leading article in *The Times* of April 28 of this year, commenting on the proposal of a leading evangelical to restore* the name of King Charles to the Prayer-Book Calendar, contained the surprising remark that "the idea of canonization or quasi-canonization—a practice which has never, save in regard to Charles, had any place in the custom of the English Church—is utterly alien to the drift of current thought." It is, on the other hand, a common reproach to the Church of England, particularly often alleged by Roman Catholics, that there can be no life in a Church whose catalogue of saints stopped dead at a given date in the Middle Ages.

"Quasi-canonization" will probably be as far as our Church will care to go for the present—the restoration or insertion of certain names in the Prayer-Book Calendar, without a formal process of beatification and canonization such as exists in the Church of Rome; and I imagine that the names to be inserted will form a subject of a perfectly legitimate bargain between our various sections. High Churchmen, for instance, will require the restoration of the name of St. Thomas of Canterbury, Evangelicals the insertion of that of Charles Simeon, and it is to be hoped that all would agree on such figures as those of Bishop Seabury, Dr. Johnson, and King Henry VI.

The Royal Founder of Eton has, on more than one occasion, been very near canonization. His followers regarded him as a martyred saint immediately after his death, and made up prayers and hymns to him; Henry VII. was inclined to make a formal application to Rome; but he was never one to part easily with money, and found that the necessary fees would be very high. I believe that in modern days a body of Roman Catholic Old Etonians again considered the matter, but nothing seems to have come of it. John Blacman's Memoir, as also two MS. accounts of his miracles in the British Museum, seems to have been preparatory to the inauguration of a process which was never actually undertaken.

Of Blacman we know little. He was a Cantor at Eton in his early days, and then Warden of King's Hall at Cambridge; he resigned this post in 1457, and entered religion as a Carthusian, living first in Somerset and then in London. We do not know at which period of his life he was the King's Confessor. His work has been difficult to meet with in the past; there are, perhaps, only two copies extant of the original printed edition (London, Copland, 1510), and Thomas Hearne's reprint (1732) was in an edition of 150 copies, and *perdu* in a collection of Chronicles. We may hope that Dr. James's enterprise will cause it to be better known to future generations of Etonians (what better "leaving-book" could a tutor give to his pupil ?) and to others; the stories of the good living in it are infinitely touching; I do not see how any Etonian could fail to be moved at the account of how, when he found any Eton boys about the Castle at Windsor, he would give them a little "tip" of money, and bid them—"Sitis boni pueri, mites et docibiles, et servi Domini," and of those who were contemplating Holy Orders—here is a lesson for schoolmasters and Dons—

* No "restoration" is, in fact, necessary; for I pointed out in a letter to *The Times* of May 1, 1915, which has never been contradicted, that the removal of the name is due to the irresponsible action of a trio of printers, resting on no Royal Proclamation, Warrant, or other authority, ecclesiastical or civil. The printers will have to be taught that their monopoly rests on a loyal reproduction of the standard entrusted to them.

"Minorascere eos potius toleramus in musicalibus, quam in scripturarum scientiis."

Dr. James has added some prayers and hymns, having for subject the sanctity of the King; one of them ("Rex Henricus, sis amicus") is still often sung at prayers in College at Eton; and his translation of the *Collectarium Mansuetudinum* puts it within the reach of those whose Latin has a little faded. There must be few of the readers of this journal to whom this fragrant old English piety does not appeal, and our warm thanks are due to the Provost for this piece of duty towards his saintly Founder.

STEPHEN GASELEE.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER